
Health Care Program for Children with Special Needs Annual 2010 Data Report

Revised July 1, 2010



Children and Youth with Special Health Care Needs Unit Preventative Services Division Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment



Colorado Health Care Program for Children with Special Needs (HCP)

Vision

All Colorado children with special health care needs will be valued, integrated and thriving

Mission

To ensure that children with special health care needs have the opportunity to grow, learn and develop to their highest individual potential.

December 2009

Acknowledgements

A sincere appreciation to the dedicated HCP Regional Office Teams, County Health Departments and County Public Health Agencies for collecting and entering HCP CHIRP Data.

A special thank you to the following people for their assistance in preparing this report:

Ashley Juhl, Barbara Gabella, CDPHE, EPE Branch Ricky Tolliver, CDPHE, DCEED Division HCP State Staff, CDPHE:

Barbara Deloian, Vickie Thomson, Eileen Forlenza, Penny Gonnella, Lynn Bindel, Kathy Watters, Stephanie Lauer, Charla Low, Kathleen Reilly, Jeff Scott, Laura Zuniga and Shirley Babler

Copies of this report may be obtained from:

Center for Healthy Families and Communities

www.mchcolorado.org

Children with Special Health Care Needs Unit

www.hcpcolorado.org

Health Care Program for Children with Special Needs

303-692-2370

This revised version of the HCP Annual 2010 Data Report dated July 1, 2010 includes the following revisions from the original report published March, 2010:

- 1) Revised Colorado Children's Health Access Program (CCHAP) Provider map and description, page 53.
- 2) Revised HCP CHIRP data, pages 78 145

Health Care Program for Children with Special Needs (HCP) 2010 Data Report – March, 2010 Volume 1

Table of Contents

Report Summary and Purpose	3
National Outcome Measures and Core HCP Strategies. National MCH Outcome Measures HCP Core Strategies for Championing a Medical Home Approach for CSHCN Outcome Measures for HCP Care Coordination Outcome Measures for HCP Collaboration for Ease of Systems Use Core Public Health Services Provided by MCH Agencies Children with Special Health Care Needs Data Set 2010	4
Overview of Colorado	13
Estimating Percent of Population of CSHCN Population by Age Population of all Colorado Children by Race/Ethnicity Multi-County Regional Offices Population by Race/Ethnicity for all Colorado Children Single County Regional Offices	14
Colorado Children's Public Health Insurance	50
HCP Care Coordination	54
HCP Collaboration for Ease of Systems Use	55
Children's Traumatic Brain Injury Trust Fund Program Overview	56
HCP Pediatric Specialty Clinics	62
Diagnostic and Evaluation (D&E) Clinics	64
Newborn Hearing ScreeningColorado Newborn Hearing Screening Report	68
Family Engagement and Family Leadership Training Initiative (FLTI)	70
Professional Shortage Areas – Maps	73
HCP CHIRP Data	78

Report Summary and Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide data to assist local HCP Regional Offices and local communities with assessment, planning and evaluation for Maternal and Child Health (MCH) operational plans and reporting for HCP contracted Scope of Work. The majority of data presented is from 2009, however footnotes may indicate specific dates.

It is hoped these data are helpful when regions assess community need and capacity for HCP Care Coordination and "ease of use" for local health care systems, community resources and supports for families and CSHCN.

In 2001, MCH established six national outcome measures to build a comprehensive coordinated system of care for CSHCN. The Children with Special Health Care Needs Unit at the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) addresses these outcome measures through the following programs:

- The Health Care Program for Children with Special Needs (HCP) at state and county level.
- The Newborn Screening Program at state and county level in collaboration with the Colorado Hospital Association and the Colorado State Laboratory.
- ❖ The Medical Home Initiative for all children in Colorado in collaboration with The Colorado Department of Health Care Policy and Finance (HCPF).
- ❖ The Family Engagement and Family Leadership Training Initiative.
- The Integrated Data System (IDS) for data system development and maintenance.

In fiscal year 2009, HCP served children and their families in Colorado's 64 counties. The HCP State Office at CDPHE contracted with 14 Regional Offices, 3 County Health Departments and 38 County Public Health Agencies (former County Nursing Services).

Data for children with special needs can often be very limited due to lack of data sources for a sub-population of all children. Data for some counties is limited by confidentiality guidelines that prohibit reporting when numbers are too small to ensure privacy.

Data used for this report includes U.S. Census data, Colorado hospital discharge data, CDPHE Vital Records, Colorado Health Care Policy and Finance for Medicaid and CHP+, Colorado Children's Health Access Program (CCHAP), Colorado Primary Care Office (CDPHE), HCP CHIRP database (CDPHE), and the National and Colorado Child Health Survey.

Data reported for all children may or may not represent CSHCN but can provide insight to inspire the need to identify sound data sources specifically for children with special health care needs.

National Outcome Measures and Core HCP Strategies

National MCH Outcome Measures:

- 1) Families of children with special health care needs will partner in decision making at all levels, and will be satisfied with the services they receive.
- 2) All children with special health care needs will receive coordinated on-going care within a medical home.
- 3) All families of children with special health care needs will have adequate private and/or public insurance to pay for the services they need.
- 4) All children will be screened early and continuously for special health care needs.
- 5) Community based service systems will be organized so families can use them easily.
- 6) All youth with special health care needs will receive the services necessary to transition to all aspects of adult life, including adult health care, work and independence.

HCP Core Strategies for Championing a Medical Home Approach for Children with Special Health Care Needs (CSHCN):

- 1) Providing HCP Care Coordination in collaboration with the child's PCP using a "medical home approach".
- 2) Collaborating with Community Partners for "easy to use" systems of community services, resources and supports.



Outcome Measures for HCP Care Coordination

HCP Care Coordination – Short Term Outcomes:

- 1) A usual source of sick and well care, other than the ER
- 2) A consistent PCP, physician, nurse practitioner, or physician assistant.
- 3) A source of payment for health care services (health insurance of other on going sources of health care)
- 4) Access to needed specialty care
- 5) Access to needed family support services.
- 6) Satisfaction with HCP Care Coordination services

HCP Care Coordination - Mid-Term Outcomes (3-5 years)

- 1) Efficacy to appropriately manage their child's healthcare
- 2) Appropriate health care utilization (usual source of care)
- 3) Family satisfaction with medical care received

HCP Care Coordination - Long Term Outcomes

- 1. Improved quality of life for themselves and their children
- 2. Decrease in health care expenditures



Outcome Measures for HCP Collaboration for Ease of Systems Use

Short Term Outcome Measures:

- 1) Improved outreach and identification of CSHCN
- 2) Effective and consistent interagency collaboration between local level partners
- 3) Increased family utilization of community resources and services

Medium Term Outcome Measures:

- 1) Easy to Use and Accessible Services
- **2)** Reduction in number of barriers for families using services (transportation, poor communication, unskilled providers, services not available, eligibility limitations, limited benefits, too much paperwork, and services not available or too costly)

Long Term Outcome Measures:

- 1) Decrease in Health Care Expenditures
- 2) Improved Quality of life for CSHCN and their Families

Based on CSHCN Unit, Local HCP Care Coordination and Local Systems Collaboration Logic Models, 2009

Core Public Health Services Provided by MCH Agencies

MCH federal, state, and other professionals developed the MCH Pyramid to provide a conceptual framework of the variety of MCH services provided through the MCH Block Grant. The pyramid includes four tiers of services for MCH populations. The model illustrates the uniqueness of the MCH Block Grant, which is the only federal program that provides services at all levels of the pyramid. These services are direct health care services (gap filling), enabling services, population-based services, and infrastructure building services. Public health programs are encouraged to provide more of the community-based services associated with the lower-level of the pyramid and to engage in the direct care services only as a provider of last resort.

The core public health services pyramid for children with special health care needs with descriptions can be found in the MCH Guidelines on the web sites at http://www.cdphe.state.co.us/ps/mch/partnering.html. The focus of the core public health services for children with special health care needs is for enabling services (HCP Care Coordination and Specialty Clinic Coordination), population-based services, and infrastructure building services. HCP direct services only include the clinical services provided during specialty clinics such as obtaining vital signs and measurements for height and weight.

Children with Special Health Care Needs HCP MCH Core Public Health Services Estimate

Percentages as reported by HCP Contractors for October 1, 2008 - September 30, 2009

Regional Office	Direct	Enabling	Population-Based	Infrastructure
	Serivces	Serivces	Serives	Building Services
	%	%	%	%
Boulder	0	25	35	40
Delta	10	60	20	10
Denver	0	50	30	20
El Paso	0	40	20	40
Jeff Co	3	27	30	40
Larimer	3	34	20	43
Las Animas-Huerfar	0	50	25	25
Northeast	10	30	20	40
Northwest	0	30	20	40
Pueblo	5	35	25	35
Southeast	10	40	25	25
Southwest	10	40	20	30
South Central	30	30	10	30
Tri County	0	40	20	40
Weld	0	60	10	30
Western Slope	10	32	29	29
Average	6	39	23	32

Data Source: MCH Core Services Final Report, December 2009.

Children with Special Health Care Needs Data Set 2010

The Children with Special Health Care Needs (CSHCN) Data Set 2010 contains recent data for Colorado and the nation including maternal and child health performance measures as well as other measures of interest in the CSHCN population.

Performance measures are determined by the federal Maternal and Child Health Bureau and by the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and are used to define problems and to facilitate planning for public health. The additional measures included in the Data Set that are not performance measures are selected by the Health Care Program for Children with Special Needs at the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment and are also used to define problems and to facilitate planning.

The data come from two sources: the Colorado Child Health Survey and the National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs. Results from the Colorado Child Health Survey (CHS) represent CSHCN ages 1 through 14 in Colorado. Results from the CHS are available for two different time periods depending on the years that the survey question was asked, 2007-2008 and 2008 only. Results from the National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs represent CSHCN ages 0 through 17 in Colorado and the nation. The national survey was conducted in 2001 and again in 2005/2006.

The CSHCN measures are shown for Colorado and the nation. No county level data are available due to the relatively small numbers of CSHCN in individual counties. The National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs shows statewide percentages for Colorado that are quite similar to the national percentages.

Please use the data contained in this data set for reference as you begin your planning process.

The following measures are used in the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment MCH Checklists for local health agencies. The measures are grouped into two sections:

- I. Care Coordination Measures (page 2)
- II. Systems Building Measures (page 3)

Children with Special Health Care Needs Data Set 2010

I. Care Coordination Measures

	National Su	National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs, Ages 0-17				
	20	001	2005-2	2006	2007-2008	
Measure	Colorado Percent	National Percent	Colorado Percent	National Percent	Colorado Percent	
Percent of CSHCN* with a personal doctor or nurse (one or more persons)	N/A	N/A	93.5	93.5	94.3†	
2. Percent of CSHCN with a usual source of care that is not the ER (sick care and advice about health)	91.0	90.7	93.5	94.3	N/A	
3. Percent of CSHCN without insurance at some point in the past year	9.3	11.6	12.7	8.8	6.7	
4. Percent of CSHCN with any unmet need for specialty care	8.1	7.2	7.5	5.4	N/A	
5. Percent of CSHCN with any unmet need for family support services	N/A	N/A	5.0	4.9	N/A	

^{*} CSHCN: Children with Special Health Care Needs

N/A - Data are not available because question was not asked on the Colorado Child Health Survey, or question differs between versions of the National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs.

Sources: National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs, Data Resource Center for Child and Adolescent Health.

http://cshcndata.org/DataQuery/SurveyAreas.aspx?yid=1

Colorado Child Health Survey, Health Statistics Section, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment.

http://www.cdphe.state.co.us/hs/mchdata/mchdata.html

[†] Data represent 2008 only

Children with Special Health Care Needs Data Set 2010

II. Systems Building Measures

	National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs, Ages 0-17, 2005-2006			
Measure	Colorado Percent	National Percent		
6. Percent of CSHCN* whose services are organized in				
ways that families can use them easily.	87.8	89.1		
(National Performance Measure 5)				

^{*} CSHCN: Children with Special Health Care Needs

Note: Data for 2001 are not available due to significant differences in the wording of this question in the earlier version of the National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs.

The data below explain difficulties that families may encounter which may not allow them to easily use CSHCN services:

	National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs, Ages 0-17, 2005-2006			
Difficulty	Colorado Percent	National Percent		
Could not get information needed	8.0	6.7		
Too much paperwork required	3.0	2.7		
Did not have enough money to pay for services	5.7	4.3		
Transportation problem	2.7	2.2		
Could not get services when needed	8.8	7.2		
Problems in communication between providers	6.4	5.5		
Could not find service providers with skills needed	3.9	4.5		
Types of services needed not available	4.0	4.4		
Not eligible for types of services needed	4.8	4.8		
Used up all eligible benefits for types of services needed	1.4	1.5		
Did not have time to figure it all out	3.2	2.7		

Note: Data for 2001 are not available because questions were not asked on the earlier version of the National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs.

Source: National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs, Data Resource Center for Child and Adolescent Health.

Health Care Program for Children with Special Needs Supplemental Data 2010

	National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs, Ages 0-17				Colorado Child Health Survey, Ages 1-14	
	20	01	2005-	2005-2006		
Measure	Colorado	National	Colorado	National	Colorado	
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	
Screening						
Percent of children screened early and continuously for special health care needs	N/A	N/A	65.5	63.8	N/A	
Medical Home						
Percent of CSHCN* who received coordinated, ongoing,						
comprehensive care within a medical home	N/A	N/A	48.2	47.1	N/A	
(National Performance Measure 3)						
Insurance						
Percent of CSHCN with insurance that is inadequate	35.9	33.8	34.6	33.1	N/A	
Percent of CSHCN whose families have adequate private and/or public insurance to pay for the services they need (National Performance Measure 4)	58.1	59.6	59.1	62.0	N/A	
Percent of CSHCN whose families pay \$1,000 or more out of pocket in medical expenses per year for their child	17.6	11.2	27.7	20.0	N/A	
Percent of CSHCN whose conditions cause family members to cut back or stop working	N/A	N/A	20.6	23.8	N/A	
Behavioral Health						
Percent of CSHCN who have difficulties with emotions, concentration, behavior, or being able to get along with other people	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	52.6	

^{*} CSHCN: Children with Special Health Care Needs

N/A - Data are not available because question was not asked on the Colorado Child Health Survey or the National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs, or question differs between versions of the National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs.

Health Care Program for Children with Special Needs Supplemental Data 2010

	lealth Care	Colorado Child Health Survey, Ages 1-14			
	20	01	2005-	2006	2007-2008
	Colorado	National	Colorado	National	Colorado
Measure	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Family Participation					
Percent of CSHCN* whose families partner in decision					
making at all levels and are satisfied with the services they	57.4	57.4	59.1	57.4	N/A
receive (National Performance Measure 2)					
Care Coordination					
Percent of CSHCN who did not receive needed dental care	7.6	10.4	N/A	N/A	7.6
in a 12-month period	7.0	10.4	14/11	14/11	7.0
Percent of CSHCN whose families felt they could have					
used extra help arranging or coordinating care among	N/A	N/A	18.3	19.5	N/A
these different health care providers or services					
Percent of CSHCN whose families usually got extra help					
that was needed with arranging or coordinating care	N/A	N/A	3.8	4.1	N/A
during the past 12 months					
Percent of CSHCN whose families reported that they					
need doctors or providers to communicate with school,	N/A	N/A	31.1	28.3	31.3
early intervention program, child care provider,	IN/A	IN/A		20.3	
vocational education, or rehabilitation program					
Percent of CSHCN whose families were dissatisfied with					
the communication among child's doctors and other health	N/A	N/A	8.2	7.4	9.3
care providers					

^{*}CSHCN: Children with Special Health Care Needs

N/A - Data are not available because question was not asked on the Colorado Child Health Survey or the National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs, or question differs between versions of the National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs.

Health Care Program for Children with Special Needs Supplemental Data 2010

		National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs, Ages 0-17† 2001 2005-2006				
Measure	Colorado Percent	National Percent	Colorado Percent	National Percent	Colorado Percent	
Transition						
Percent of CSHCN* ages 12-17 who have not discussed with a doctor or provider his/her health care needs as he/she becomes an adult	N/A	N/A	56.0	53.8	N/A	
Percent CSHCN ages 12-17 whose doctors or providers have not talked with child about having to see doctors or health care providers who treat adults	N/A	N/A	45.4	49.3	N/A	
Percent of CSHCN ages 12-17 who received the services necessary to make transitions to all aspects of adult life, including adult health care, work and independence (National Performance Measure 6)	N/A	N/A	47.0	41.2	N/A	

^{*} CSHCN: Children with Special Health Care Needs

N/A - Data are not available because question was not asked on the Colorado Child Health Survey or the National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs, or question differs between versions of the National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs.


Source: National Survey of Children with Special Health Care Needs, Data Resource Center for Child and Adolescent Health. http://cshcndata.org/DataQuery/SurveyAreas.aspx?yid=1

Colorado Child Health Survey, Health Statistics Section, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment. http://www.cdphe.state.co.us/hs/mchdata/mchdata.html

These Data Sets for MCH/HCP Planning are also available online:

Children with Special Health Care Needs (CSHCN) Data Set 2010, www.mchcolorado.org
Health Care Program for Children with Special Needs Supplemental
Data 2010, www.mchcolorado.org

[†] Data represent children ages 0-17 unless otherwise specified in measure



Overview Of Colorado

Colorado is the eighth largest state geographically. Colorado is 104,247 square miles, 387 miles from East to West and 276 miles from North to South. The eastern half of the state has high flat plains and rolling prairies that gradually rise westward to the foothills and the higher ranges of the Rocky Mountains. The Continental Divide runs from North to South through East Central Colorado and bisects the state into Eastern and Western Slopes. The area from North to South just East of the foothills is known as the Front Range.

The state can be divided into four distinct regions often based on high mountain passes: the Front Range, the Western Slope, the Eastern Plains and the San Luis Valley. Close to 82 percent of Colorado's population lives in the Front Range which includes the metropolitan areas of Denver, Aurora, Boulder, Ft. Collins, Greeley, Colorado Springs, and Pueblo. The San Luis Valley in the southern part of the state is the region with the smallest population, with about 46,000 residents. Over fifteen percent of Colorado's residents are considered rural, living outside urban areas.

*Colorado has more counties identified as "pioneer" counties than rural counties. The Rural Urban Commuting Areas (RUCA) and the U.S. Census Bureau both use criteria to determine "pioneer" counties. The following Colorado Counties currently have the designation: Jackson, Moffat, Rio Blanco, Hinsdale, Mineral, Gunnison, Saguache, Custer, San Miguel, Dolores, San Juan, Costilla, Las Animas, Huerfano, Baca, Bent, Kiowa, Cheyenne, Kit Carson, Lincoln, Yuma, Washington and Sedgwick.

^{*}Source: Steve Holloway, Primary Care Office, CDPHE.

Estimating Percent of Population of CSHCN

Colorado uses the broad definition of Children with Special Health Care Needs (CSHCN) as defined by the Maternal and Child Health Bureau (MCHB) as "children who have or are at increased risk for a chronic physical, developmental, behavioral, or emotional condition and who also require health and related services of a type or amount beyond that required by children generally."

Using this broad MCH definition, 17.1 percent of children in Colorado ages 0-17 have a special health care need based on results from the 2007 National Survey of Children's Health (NSCH).

In Colorado, there are an estimated 209,000 children ages 0-17 with a special health care need. This number (209,000) is only an estimate and is not an exact count of children with special health care needs in the state.

County population data for all children ages 0-17 multiplied by 17.1 percent equals the estimated number of children 0-17 who have special health care needs in your county. For example: 30,000 x .171 = 5,130. Estimates are less precise in counties with small populations.

When you apply the 17.1 percent to county population data for all children in your county, ages 0-17, please remember the result is only an estimate based on survey data collected in 2007. It does not represent the exact number of children with special health care needs in your community/county.

Updated data for children/youth with special health care needs ages 0-17 will be available upon completion of the 2011 NSCH. Data for youth ages 18-21 with special health care needs are not available from the NSCH or the Colorado Child Health Survey (CHS).



Population By Age

Projected Pop	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Adams County Regional Office, 2009									
	-	Ma	ale	Fen	nale	To	tal			
		Z	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total			
County	Age Group (Years)									
Adams	0 to 3	11,324	51%	10,721	49%	22,045	15%			
	3 to 5	7,406	52%	6,970	48%	14,375	10%			
	5 to 6	3,977	51%	3,794	49%	7,771	5%			
	6 to 13	25,746	51%	24,437	49%	50,182	34%			
	13 to 18	16,245	51%	15,729	49%	31,974	22%			
	18 to 21	9,777	51%	9,434	49%	19,211	13%			
Total	0 to 21	74,475	51%	71,084	49%	145,559	100%			

Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Alamosa County Regional Office, 2009									
		Ma	ale	Fen	nale	Total			
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total		
County	Age Group (Years)								
Alamosa	0 to 3	389	51%	371	49%	760	14%		
	3 to 5	248	51%	236	49%	484	9%		
	5 to 6	129	51%	122	49%	251	5%		
	6 to 13	786	53%	696	47%	1,482	27%		
	13 to 18	602	53%	538	47%	1,140	21%		
	18 to 21	691	49%	714	51%	1,405	25%		
Total	0 to 21	2,845	52%	2,677	48%	5,522	100%		

Projected Pop	oulation by Age	Group in Ye	ears for Arap	ahoe County	y Regional C	Office, 2009		
		Ma	ale	Fen	nale	То	Total	
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total	
County	Age Group (Years)							
Arapahoe	0 to 3	12,621	51%	12,003	49%	24,624	15%	
	3 to 5	8,383	51%	7,979	49%	16,362	10%	
	5 to 6	4,298	51%	4,093	49%	8,391	5%	
	6 to 13	27,338	51%	26,203	49%	53,541	32%	
	13 to 18	19,620	51%	18,494	49%	38,114	23%	
	18 to 21	12,723	52%	11,903	48%	24,626	15%	
Total	0 to 21	84,983	51%	80,675	49%	165,658	100%	

Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Archuleta County Regional Office, 2009									
		Ma	ale	Fen	nale	Тс	tal		
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total		
County	Age Group (Years)								
Archuleta	0 to 3	218	51%	208	49%	426	13%		
	3 to 5	128	51%	123	49%	251	8%		
	5 to 6	77	51%	74	49%	151	5%		
	6 to 13	560	52%	515	48%	1,075	33%		
	13 to 18	446	52%	406	48%	852	26%		
	18 to 21	267	51%	254	49%	521	16%		
Total	0 to 21	1,696	52%	1,580	48%	3,276	100%		

Projected Pop	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Baca County Regional Office, 2009										
		Male		Female		Total					
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
Baca	0 to 3	60	51%	57	49%	117	12%				
	3 to 5	29	50%	29	50%	58	6%				
	5 to 6	17	52%	16	48%	33	4%				
	6 to 13	162	49%	169	51%	331	35%				
	13 to 18	158	60%	105	40%	263	28%				
	18 to 21	80	59%	56	41%	136	14%				
Total	0 to 21	506	54%	432	46%	938	100%				

Projected Pop	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Bent County Regional Office, 2009										
		Ma	ale	Fen	nale	Total					
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
Bent	0 to 3	104	51%	99	49%	203	14%				
	3 to 5	62	52%	58	48%	120	8%				
	5 to 6	28	52%	26	48%	54	4%				
	6 to 13	279	51%	268	49%	547	36%				
	13 to 18	188	50%	190	50%	378	25%				
	18 to 21	95	48%	105	53%	200	13%				
Total	0 to 21	756	50%	746	50%	1,502	100%				

Projected Po	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Boulder County Regional Office, 2009										
		Ma	ale	Female		Total					
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
Boulder	0 to 3	5,701	51%	5,380	49%	11,081	13%				
	3 to 5	3,717	51%	3,526	49%	7,243	9%				
	5 to 6	1,895	52%	1,774	48%	3,668	4%				
	6 to 13	12,531	51%	12,132	49%	24,663	29%				
	13 to 18	8,863	51%	8,657	49%	17,520	21%				
	18 to 21	10,713	51%	10,236	49%	20,949	25%				
	0 to 21	43,420	51%	41,704	49%	85,124	100%				

Projected Pop	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Broomfield County Regional Office, 2009									
	Ma		ale	Female		Total				
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	Ν	% of Total			
County	Age Group (Years)									
Broomfield	0 to 3	1,315	49%	1,356	51%	2,671	14%			
	3 to 5	884	48%	949	52%	1,833	10%			
	5 to 6	505	50%	511	50%	1,016	5%			
	6 to 13	3,314	51%	3,245	49%	6,559	35%			
	13 to 18	2,352	53%	2,071	47%	4,424	24%			
	18 to 21	1,101	52%	1,018	48%	2,119	11%			
Total	0 to 21	9,471	51%	9,151	49%	18,622	100%			

Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Chaffee County Regional Office, 2009							
		Ma	Male		Female		tal
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
Chaffee	0 to 3	217	51%	206	49%	423	12%
	3 to 5	166	51%	158	49%	324	9%
	5 to 6	83	51%	79	49%	162	5%
	6 to 13	582	50%	589	50%	1,171	33%
	13 to 18	471	53%	424	47%	895	25%
	18 to 21	284	48%	310	52%	594	17%
Total	0 to 21	1,803	51%	1,766	49%	3,569	100%

Projected Po	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Cheyenne County Regional Office, 2009										
		Ma	Male		nale	Total					
		Z	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
Cheyenne	0 to 3	38	52%	35	48%	73	14%				
	3 to 5	19	50%	19	50%	38	7%				
	5 to 6	9	53%	8	47%	17	3%				
	6 to 13	86	52%	80	48%	166	32%				
	13 to 18	69	52%	63	48%	132	25%				
	18 to 21	50	50%	50	50%	100	19%				
Total	0 to 21	271	52%	255	48%	526	100%				

Projected Pop	ulation by Age	Group in Ye	ears for Clea	r Creek Cou	nty Regiona	Office, 2009	9
		Ma	ale	Fen	nale	Total	
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
Clear Creek	0 to 3	144	51%	137	49%	281	13%
	3 to 5	88	51%	84	49%	172	8%
	5 to 6	50	52%	47	48%	97	4%
	6 to 13	379	51%	371	49%	750	34%
	13 to 18	285	49%	291	51%	576	26%
	18 to 21	169	50%	171	50%	340	15%
Total	0 to 21	1,115	50%	1,101	50%	2,216	100%

Projected Po	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Conejos County Regional Office, 2009										
		Ma	ale	Fen	nale	To	tal				
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
Conejos	0 to 3	196	51%	186	49%	382	14%				
	3 to 5	130	51%	124	49%	254	9%				
	5 to 6	61	51%	58	49%	119	4%				
	6 to 13	446	49%	457	51%	903	33%				
	13 to 18	345	51%	337	49%	682	25%				
	18 to 21	183	48%	199	52%	382	14%				
Total	0 to 21	1,361	50%	1,361	50%	2,722	100%				

Projected Po	pulation by Age	Group in Ye	ears for Cost	illa County F	Regional Offi	ce, 2009	
		Ma	ale	Fen	nale	To	tal
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
Costilla	0 to 3	50	51%	49	49%	99	11%
	3 to 5	43	51%	41	49%	84	10%
	5 to 6	16	52%	15	48%	31	4%
	6 to 13	159	53%	140	47%	299	34%
	13 to 18	114	53%	103	47%	217	25%
	18 to 21	70	49%	73	51%	143	16%
Total	0 to 21	452	52%	421	48%	873	100%

Projected Po	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Crowley County Regional Office, 2009								
		Ma	Male		nale	Total			
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total		
County	Age Group (Years)								
Crowley	0 to 3	61	52%	57	48%	118	10%		
	3 to 5	49	51%	47	49%	96	8%		
	5 to 6	33	51%	32	49%	65	5%		
	6 to 13	209	50%	207	50%	416	34%		
	13 to 18	159	52%	146	48%	305	25%		
	18 to 21	121	58%	88	42%	209	17%		
Total	0 to 21	632	52%	577	48%	1,209	100%		

Projected F	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Custer County Regional Office, 2009										
		Ma	ale	Female		Total					
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
Custer	0 to 3	41	50%	41	50%	82	9%				
	3 to 5	27	51%	26	49%	53	6%				
	5 to 6	18	51%	17	49%	35	4%				
	6 to 13	172	52%	159	48%	331	36%				
	13 to 18	117	44%	148	56%	265	28%				
	18 to 21	97	58%	69	42%	166	18%				
Total	0 to 21	472	51%	460	49%	932	100%				

Projected Pop	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Delta County Regional Office, 2009										
		Male		Female		Total					
		N	% of Males in Age group	Z	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
Delta	0 to 3	572	51%	545	49%	1,117	13%				
	3 to 5	373	51%	357	49%	730	9%				
	5 to 6	200	51%	191	49%	391	5%				
	6 to 13	1,404	51%	1,330	49%	2,734	33%				
	13 to 18	1,116	53%	1,006	47%	2,122	25%				
	18 to 21	641	50%	645	50%	1,286	15%				
Total	0 to 21	4,306	51%	4,074	49%	8,380	100%				

Projected Pop	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Denver County Regional Office, 2009									
		Ma	ale	Fen	nale To		otal			
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total			
County	Age Group (Years)									
Denver	0 to 3	16,260	51%	15,477	49%	31,737	17%			
	3 to 5	11,864	51%	11,297	49%	23,161	12%			
	5 to 6	5,431	51%	5,171	49%	10,602	6%			
	6 to 13	31,938	51%	30,329	49%	62,267	33%			
	13 to 18	18,283	51%	17,457	49%	35,740	19%			
	18 to 21	12,415	50%	12,463	50%	24,878	13%			
Total	0 to 21	96,191	51%	92,194	49%	188,385	100%			

Projected Pop	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Dolores County Regional Office, 2009								
			ale	Female		Total			
		N	% of Males in Age group	Ν	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total		
County	Age Group (Years)								
Dolores	0 to 3	42	51%	40	49%	82	16%		
	3 to 5	26	52%	24	48%	50	10%		
	5 to 6	12	50%	12	50%	24	5%		
	6 to 13	84	50%	83	50%	167	32%		
	13 to 18	69	56%	54	44%	123	24%		
	18 to 21	34	49%	36	51%	70	14%		
Total	0 to 21	267	52%	249	48%	516	100%		

Projected Po	pulation by Age	Group in Ye	ears for Doug	glas County	Regional Of	fice, 2009	
		Ma	Male		Female		tal
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
Douglas	0 to 3	6,731	51%	6,416	49%	13,147	14%
	3 to 5	4,802	51%	4,596	49%	9,398	10%
	5 to 6	2,431	51%	2,332	49%	4,763	5%
	6 to 13	17,301	51%	16,650	49%	33,951	35%
	13 to 18	11,789	51%	11,395	49%	23,184	24%
	18 to 21	6,466	51%	6,302	49%	12,768	13%
Total	0 to 21	49,520	51%	47,691	49%	97,211	100%

Projected Pop	ulation by Age	Group in Ye	ears for Eagl	e County Re	gional Office	e, 2009	
		Ma	Male		nale	Total	
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
Eagle	0 to 3	1,340	51%	1,277	49%	2,617	16%
	3 to 5	858	51%	819	49%	1,677	10%
	5 to 6	451	51%	431	49%	882	5%
	6 to 13	2,922	51%	2,817	49%	5,739	36%
	13 to 18	1,752	52%	1,623	48%	3,375	21%
	18 to 21	934	51%	915	49%	1,849	11%
Total	0 to 21	8,257	51%	7,882	49%	16,139	100%

Projected F	Population by Age	Group in Ye	ears for El Pa	aso County F	Regional Offi	ce, 2009	
		Ma	Male		nale	Total	
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
El Paso	0 to 3	13,696	51%	13,029	49%	26,725	15%
	3 to 5	8,901	51%	8,471	49%	17,372	9%
	5 to 6	4,303	51%	4,097	49%	8,400	5%
	6 to 13	30,461	52%	28,520	48%	58,981	32%
	13 to 18	21,282	52%	19,569	48%	40,851	22%
	18 to 21	17,520	56%	13,705	44%	31,225	17%
Total	0 to 21	96,163	52%	87,391	48%	183,554	100%

Projected Por	oulation by Age	Group in Ye	ears for Elbe	rt County Re	egional Office	e, 2009	
		Ma	Male		Female		tal
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
Elbert	0 to 3	316	51%	301	49%	617	10%
	3 to 5	221	51%	211	49%	432	7%
	5 to 6	121	51%	115	49%	236	4%
	6 to 13	1,066	51%	1,012	49%	2,078	34%
	13 to 18	891	50%	900	50%	1,791	29%
	18 to 21	502	49%	524	51%	1,026	17%
	0 to 21	3,117	50%	3,063	50%	6,180	100%

Projected Po	pulation by Age	Group in Ye	ears for Frem	nont County	Regional Of	fice, 2009	
		Ma	Male		nale	Total	
		Ν	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
Fremont	0 to 3	667	51%	634	49%	1,301	13%
	3 to 5	437	51%	416	49%	853	8%
	5 to 6	219	51%	209	49%	428	4%
	6 to 13	1,625	51%	1,592	49%	3,217	31%
	13 to 18	1,414	52%	1,307	48%	2,721	26%
	18 to 21	968	53%	851	47%	1,819	18%
Total	0 to 21	5,330	52%	5,009	48%	10,339	100%

Projected Por	oulation by Age	Group in Ye	ears for Garfi	ield County F	Regional Off	ice, 2009	
		Ma	Male		Female		tal
		N	% of Males in Age group	Ν	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
Garfield	0 to 3	1,518	51%	1,448	49%	2,966	16%
	3 to 5	983	51%	941	49%	1,924	10%
	5 to 6	498	51%	477	49%	975	5%
	6 to 13	3,254	51%	3,075	49%	6,329	34%
	13 to 18	2,064	51%	2,014	49%	4,078	22%
	18 to 21	1,160	50%	1,146	50%	2,306	12%
Total	0 to 21	9,477	51%	9,101	49%	18,578	100%

Projected Po	pulation by Age	Group in Ye	ears for Gilpi	n County Re	egional Office	e, 2009	
		Ma	ale	Female		Total	
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
Gilpin	0 to 3	90	51%	87	49%	177	15%
	3 to 5	52	51%	50	49%	102	8%
	5 to 6	29	52%	27	48%	56	5%
	6 to 13	218	52%	204	48%	422	35%
	13 to 18	138	50%	139	50%	277	23%
	18 to 21	82	47%	91	53%	173	14%
Total	0 to 21	609	50%	598	50%	1,207	100%

Projected Pop	ulation by Age	Group in Ye	ears for Gran	d County Re	egional Offic	e, 2009	
		Ma	Male		nale	Total	
		Ν	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	Ν	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
Grand	0 to 3	255	51%	243	49%	498	14%
	3 to 5	177	51%	169	49%	346	10%
	5 to 6	79	51%	76	49%	155	4%
	6 to 13	609	48%	647	52%	1,256	35%
	13 to 18	422	52%	384	48%	806	23%
	18 to 21	261	53%	236	47%	497	14%
Total	0 to 21	1,803	51%	1,755	49%	3,558	100%

Projected Po	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Gunnison County Regional Office, 2009										
		Ma	Male		nale	Total					
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
Gunnison	0 to 3	256	51%	244	49%	500	11%				
	3 to 5	191	51%	182	49%	373	8%				
	5 to 6	97	51%	93	49%	190	4%				
	6 to 13	607	51%	573	49%	1,180	26%				
	13 to 18	487	52%	451	48%	938	21%				
	18 to 21	728	55%	590	45%	1,318	29%				
Total	0 to 21	2,366	53%	2,133	47%	4,499	100%				

Projected Pop	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Hinsdale County Regional Office, 2009										
		Ma	ale	Fen	nale	Total					
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	Z	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
Hinsdale	0 to 3	15	54%	13	46%	28	13%				
	3 to 5	9	53%	8	47%	17	8%				
	5 to 6	4	50%	4	50%	8	4%				
	6 to 13	37	51%	36	49%	73	35%				
	13 to 18	30	57%	23	43%	53	25%				
	18 to 21	10	34%	19	66%	29	14%				
Total	0 to 21	105	50%	103	50%	208	100%				

Projected Po	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Huerfano County Regional Office, 2009								
		Ma	ale	Fen	nale	Total			
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total		
County	Age Group (Years)								
Huerfano	0 to 3	97	51%	92	49%	189	11%		
	3 to 5	67	51%	64	49%	131	8%		
	5 to 6	40	51%	38	49%	78	5%		
	6 to 13	292	49%	300	51%	592	35%		
	13 to 18	230	52%	213	48%	443	26%		
	18 to 21	123	50%	125	50%	248	15%		
Total	0 to 21	849	51%	832	49%	1,681	100%		

Projected Pop	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Jackson County Regional Office, 2009								
		Male		Fen	nale	Total			
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total		
County	Age Group (Years)								
Jackson	0 to 3	19	51%	18	49%	37	13%		
	3 to 5	8	50%	8	50%	16	9%		
	5 to 6	5	56%	4	44%	9	4%		
	6 to 13	53	46%	61	54%	114	32%		
	13 to 18	48	43%	63	57%	111	25%		
	18 to 21	27	47%	31	53%	58	17%		
Total	0 to 21	160	46%	185	54%	345	100%		

Projected Po	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Jefferson County Regional Office, 2009										
		Ma	ale	Female		Total					
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
Jefferson	0 to 3	9,630	51%	9,166	49%	18,796	14%				
	3 to 5	6,250	51%	5,950	49%	12,200	7%				
	5 to 6	3,247	51%	3,090	49%	6,337	5%				
	6 to 13	23,000	51%	21,899	49%	44,899	33%				
	13 to 18	18,142	51%	17,246	49%	35,388	29%				
	18 to 21	13,079	53%	11,686	47%	24,765	13%				
Total	0 to 21	73,348	52%	69,036	48%	142,384	100%				

Projected Po	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Kiowa County Regional Office, 2009									
		Ma	Male		Female		tal			
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total			
County	Age Group (Years)									
Kiowa	0 to 3	26	53%	23	47%	49	14%			
	3 to 5	13	52%	12	48%	25	7%			
	5 to 6	8	50%	8	50%	16	5%			
	6 to 13	64	56%	51	44%	115	33%			
	13 to 18	55	54%	47	46%	102	29%			
	18 to 21	22	49%	23	51%	45	13%			
Total	0 to 21	188	53%	164	47%	352	100%			

Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Kit Carson County Regional Office, 2009							
	Male		Fen	nale	Total		
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
Kit Carson	0 to 3	150	51%	142	49%	292	13%
	3 to 5	107	51%	101	49%	208	9%
	5 to 6	47	51%	45	49%	92	4%
	6 to 13	351	52%	328	48%	679	30%
	13 to 18	286	50%	291	50%	577	26%
	18 to 21	229	57%	172	43%	401	18%
Total	0 to 21	1,170	52%	1,079	48%	2,249	100%

Projected Pop	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for La Plata County Regional Office, 2009										
		Ma	ale	Female		Total					
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
La Plata	0 to 3	920	51%	877	49%	1,797	13%				
	3 to 5	580	51%	554	49%	1,134	8%				
	5 to 6	298	51%	285	49%	583	4%				
	6 to 13	2,025	52%	1,882	48%	3,907	29%				
	13 to 18	1,525	49%	1,572	51%	3,097	23%				
	18 to 21	1,584	51%	1,542	49%	3,126	23%				
Total	0 to 21	6,932	51%	6,712	49%	13,644	100%				

Projected Pop	ulation by Age	Group in Ye	ears for Lake	County Reg	gional Office	, 2009	
		Ma	Male		Female		tal
		Ν	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	Ν	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
Lake	0 to 3	192	51%	183	49%	375	13%
	3 to 5	127	51%	121	49%	248	9%
	5 to 6	65	51%	62	49%	127	5%
	6 to 13	492	51%	467	49%	959	34%
	13 to 18	354	54%	302	46%	656	24%
	18 to 21	207	49%	213	51%	420	15%
Total	0 to 21	1,437	52%	1,348	48%	2,785	100%

Projected F	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Larimer County Regional Office, 2009											
_		Ma	Male		nale	Total						
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total					
County	Age Group (Years)											
Larimer	0 to 3	5,522	51%	5,259	49%	10,781	13%					
	3 to 5	3,568	51%	3,405	49%	6,973	8%					
	5 to 6	1,882	51%	1,797	49%	3,679	4%					
	6 to 13	12,650	51%	11,987	49%	24,637	30%					
	13 to 18	9,221	51%	8,796	49%	18,017	22%					
	18 to 21	9,570	50%	9,436	50%	19,006	23%					
Total	0 to 21	42,413	51%	40,680	49%	83,093	100%					

Projected Pop	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Las Animas County Regional Office, 2009										
		Ma	ale	Fen	nale	Total					
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
Las Animas	0 to 3	287	51%	275	49%	562	13%				
	3 to 5	190	51%	182	49%	372	9%				
	5 to 6	103	51%	98	49%	201	5%				
	6 to 13	714	49%	741	51%	1,455	33%				
	13 to 18	584	52%	535	48%	1,119	26%				
	18 to 21	353	54%	299	46%	652	15%				
Total	0 to 21	2,231	51%	2,130	49%	4,361	100%				

Projected Por	oulation by Age	Group in Ye	ears for Linco	oln County R	egional Offic	ce, 2009	
		Ma	Male		nale	Total	
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
Lincoln	0 to 3	92	52%	86	48%	178	14%
	3 to 5	44	51%	42	49%	86	7%
	5 to 6	28	52%	26	48%	54	4%
	6 to 13	188	51%	181	49%	369	29%
	13 to 18	166	55%	136	45%	302	24%
	18 to 21	170	65%	93	35%	263	21%
Total	0 to 21	688	55%	564	45%	1,252	100%

Projected Pop	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Logan County Regional Office, 2009								
		Male		Fen	nale	Total			
		N	% of Males in Age group	Ν	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total		
County	Age Group (Years)								
Logan	0 to 3	376	51%	359	49%	735	13%		
	3 to 5	230	51%	219	49%	449	8%		
	5 to 6	135	51%	128	49%	263	5%		
	6 to 13	1,028	51%	975	49%	2,003	36%		
	13 to 18	761	52%	693	48%	1,454	26%		
	18 to 21	363	50%	360	50%	723	13%		
Total	0 to 21	2,893	51%	2,734	49%	5,627	100%		

Projected Po	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Mesa County Regional Office, 2009										
		Ma	ale	Fen	nale	To	tal				
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
Mesa	0 to 3	3,182	51%	3,036	49%	6,218	15%				
	3 to 5	2,040	51%	1,954	49%	3,994	10%				
	5 to 6	1,013	51%	971	49%	1,984	5%				
	6 to 13	6,667	51%	6,366	49%	13,033	31%				
	13 to 18	4,834	51%	4,725	49%	9,559	23%				
	18 to 21	3,589	50%	3,632	50%	7,221	17%				
Total	0 to 21	21,325	51%	20,684	49%	42,009	100%				

Projected Po	pulation by Age	Group in Ye	ears for Mine	ral County F	Regional Offi	ce, 2009	
		Ma	ale	Fen	nale	Total	
		Ν	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
Mineral	0 to 3	8	53%	7	47%	15	7%
	3 to 5	9	53%	8	47%	17	8%
	5 to 6	4	50%	4	50%	8	4%
	6 to 13	36	51%	35	49%	71	35%
	13 to 18	35	56%	28	44%	63	31%
	18 to 21	15	52%	14	48%	29	14%
Total	0 to 21	107	53%	96	47%	203	100%

Projected F	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Moffat County Regional Office, 2009										
		Ma	Male		nale	Total					
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
Moffat	0 to 3	337	51%	322	49%	659	15%				
	3 to 5	200	51%	191	49%	391	9%				
	5 to 6	110	51%	105	49%	215	5%				
	6 to 13	754	52%	691	48%	1,445	33%				
	13 to 18	530	52%	487	48%	1,017	23%				
	18 to 21	358	52%	334	48%	692	16%				
Total	0 to 21	2,289	52%	2,130	48%	4,419	100%				

Projected Pop	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Montezuma County Regional Office, 2009									
		Ma	Male		nale	Total				
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total			
County	Age Group (Years)									
Montezuma	0 to 3	513	51%	487	49%	1,000	13%			
	3 to 5	324	51%	308	49%	632	9%			
	5 to 6	167	51%	159	49%	326	4%			
	6 to 13	1,242	50%	1,227	50%	2,469	33%			
	13 to 18	997	53%	884	47%	1,881	25%			
	18 to 21	589	53%	526	47%	1,115	15%			
Total	0 to 21	3,832	52%	3,591	48%	7,423	100%			

Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Montrose County Regional Office, 2009								
		Ma	ale	Fen	nale	Total		
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total	
County	Age Group (Years)							
Montrose	0 to 3	843	51%	805	49%	1,648	14%	
	3 to 5	600	51%	576	49%	1,176	10%	
	5 to 6	291	51%	279	49%	570	5%	
	6 to 13	2,100	51%	2,006	49%	4,106	34%	
	13 to 18	1,535	51%	1,453	49%	2,988	25%	
	18 to 21	816	49%	844	51%	1,660	14%	
Total	0 to 21	6,185	51%	5,963	49%	12,148	100%	

Projected F	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Morgan County Regional Office, 2009										
		Ma	Male		nale	Total					
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
Morgan	0 to 3	664	51%	633	49%	1,297	14%				
	3 to 5	443	51%	422	49%	865	9%				
	5 to 6	238	51%	226	49%	464	5%				
	6 to 13	1,780	52%	1,655	48%	3,435	36%				
	13 to 18	1,164	51%	1,121	49%	2,285	24%				
	18 to 21	575	51%	545	49%	1,120	12%				
Total	0 to 21	4,864	51%	4,602	49%	9,466	100%				

Projected Pop	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Otero County Regional Office, 2009									
		Ma	ale	Fen	nale	To	tal			
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total			
County	Age Group (Years)									
Otero	0 to 3	390	51%	371	49%	761	14%			
	3 to 5	298	51%	284	49%	582	10%			
	5 to 6	158	51%	150	49%	308	6%			
	6 to 13	983	52%	915	48%	1,898	34%			
	13 to 18	672	51%	637	49%	1,309	24%			
	18 to 21	361	51%	347	49%	708	13%			
Total	0 to 21	2,862	51%	2,704	49%	5,566	100%			

Projected Por	oulation by Age	Group in Ye	ars for Oura	y County Re	egional Office	e, 200	
		Ma	ale	Fen	nale	Total	
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
Ouray	0 to 3	69	51%	66	49%	135	12%
	3 to 5	46	51%	44	49%	90	8%
	5 to 6	25	51%	24	49%	49	4%
	6 to 13	178	49%	183	51%	361	31%
	13 to 18	165	53%	144	47%	309	27%
	18 to 21	111	53%	99	47%	210	18%
Total	0 to 21	594	51%	560	49%	1,154	100%

Projected P	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Park County Regional Office, 2009										
		Ma	ale	Fen	nale	Total					
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
Park	0 to 3	238	51%	227	49%	465	11%				
	3 to 5	183	51%	175	49%	358	8%				
	5 to 6	88	51%	84	49%	172	4%				
	6 to 13	724	51%	695	49%	1,419	34%				
	13 to 18	588	51%	562	49%	1,150	27%				
	18 to 21	334	51%	324	49%	658	16%				
Total	0 to 21	2,155	51%	2,067	49%	4,222	100%				

Projected Po	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Phillips County Regional Office, 2009										
		Ma	ale	Fen	nale	Total					
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
Phillips	0 to 3	99	51%	94	49%	193	14%				
	3 to 5	72	51%	68	49%	140	10%				
	5 to 6	36	51%	34	49%	70	5%				
	6 to 13	230	50%	226	50%	456	34%				
	13 to 18	158	49%	164	51%	322	24%				
	18 to 21	82	48%	89	52%	171	13%				
Total	0 to 21	677	50%	675	50%	1,352	100%				

Projected Pop	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Pitkin County Regional Office, 2009								
	-	Ma	ale	Fen	Female		tal		
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total		
County	Age Group (Years)								
Pitkin	0 to 3	267	51%	255	49%	522	15%		
	3 to 5	188	51%	180	49%	368	11%		
	5 to 6	88	51%	84	49%	172	5%		
	6 to 13	562	50%	573	50%	1,135	33%		
	13 to 18	404	54%	351	46%	755	22%		
	18 to 21	278	56%	218	44%	496	14%		
Total	0 to 21	1,787	52%	1,661	48%	3,448	100%		

Projected P	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Prowers County Regional Office, 2009										
		Ma	Male		Female		tal				
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
Prowers	0 to 3	294	51%	280	49%	574	13%				
	3 to 5	234	51%	222	49%	456	10%				
	5 to 6	107	51%	101	49%	208	5%				
	6 to 13	836	53%	734	47%	1,570	36%				
	13 to 18	544	52%	498	48%	1,042	24%				
	18 to 21	249	47%	281	53%	530	12%				
Total	0 to 21	2,264	52%	2,116	48%	4,380	100%				

Projected Pop	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Pueblo County Regional Office, 2009									
	Ma		ale	Female		Total				
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total			
County	Age Group (Years)									
Pueblo	0 to 3	3,299	51%	3,140	49%	6,439	14%			
	3 to 5	2,130	51%	2,030	49%	4,160	9%			
	5 to 6	1,061	51%	1,012	49%	2,073	5%			
	6 to 13	7,488	51%	7,172	49%	14,660	32%			
	13 to 18	5,525	51%	5,326	49%	10,851	24%			
	18 to 21	3,969	51%	3,856	49%	7,825	17%			
Total	0 to 21	23,472	51%	22,536	49%	46,008	100%			

Projected Pop	ulation by Age	Group in Ye	ars for Rio B	lanco Count	ty Regional (Office, 2009		
		Ma	ale	Fen	Female		Total	
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total	
County	Age Group (Years)							
Rio Blanco	0 to 3	163	51%	156	49%	319	16%	
	3 to 5	98	51%	94	49%	192	10%	
	5 to 6	51	51%	49	49%	100	5%	
	6 to 13	301	49%	314	51%	615	31%	
	13 to 18	235	51%	228	49%	463	23%	
	18 to 21	170	53%	151	47%	321	16%	
Total	0 to 21	1,018	51%	992	49%	2,010	100%	

Projected Popu	lation by Age	Group in Yea	ars for Rio G	rande Coun	ty Regional	Office, 2009)
		Male		Fen	nale	Total	
		Ν	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
Rio Grande	0 to 3	239	51%	228	49%	467	13%
	3 to 5	176	51%	167	49%	343	10%
	5 to 6	90	51%	86	49%	176	5%
	6 to 13	628	50%	634	50%	1,262	35%
	13 to 18	425	48%	459	52%	884	25%
	18 to 21	225	50%	222	50%	447	12%
	0 to 21	1,783	50%	1,796	50%	3,579	100%

Projected Popul	ation by Age G	roup in Yea	rs for Routt	County Reg	ional Office,	2009		
		Ma	ale	Fen	Female		Total	
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total	
County	Age Group (Years)							
Routt	0 to 3	417	51%	398	49%	815	13%	
	3 to 5	280	51%	268	49%	548	9%	
	5 to 6	147	51%	140	49%	287	5%	
	6 to 13	991	51%	937	49%	1,928	32%	
	13 to 18	710	48%	763	52%	1,473	24%	
	18 to 21	526	53%	461	47%	987	16%	
Total	0 to 21	3,071	51%	2,967	49%	6,038	100%	

Projected Popu	ılation by Age G	roup in Yea	rs for Sagua	che County	Regional O	ffice, 2009	
		Ma	ale	Female		Total	
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
Saguache	0 to 3	137	51%	131	49%	268	13%
	3 to 5	78	51%	74	49%	152	7%
	5 to 6	51	52%	48	48%	99	5%
	6 to 13	388	51%	366	49%	754	37%
	13 to 18	252	49%	264	51%	516	25%
	18 to 21	142	52%	133	48%	275	13%
Total	0 to 21	1,048	51%	1,016	49%	2,064	100%

Projected Pop	pulation by Age (Group in Yea	ars for San J	uan County	Regional O	ffice, 2009	
		Ma	ale	Female		Total	
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
San Juan	0 to 3	10	53%	9	47%	19	16%
	3 to 5	5	50%	5	50%	10	9%
	5 to 6	4	50%	4	50%	8	7%
	6 to 13	19	51%	18	49%	37	32%
	13 to 18	9	35%	17	65%	26	22%
	18 to 21	9	56%	7	44%	16	14%
Total	0 to 21	56	48%	60	52%	116	100%

Projected Popu	ulation by Age G	Group in Yea	rs for San M	liguel Count	y Regional (Office, 2009	
		Ma	ale	Fen	Female		tal
		N	% of Males in Age group		% of Females in Age group		% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
San Miguel	0 to 3	158	51%	151	49%	309	17%
	3 to 5	84	51%	80	49%	164	9%
	5 to 6	46	51%	44	49%	90	5%
	6 to 13	293	51%	277	49%	570	32%
	13 to 18	200	50%	204	50%	404	23%
	18 to 21	120	50%	119	50%	239	13%
Total	0 to 21	901	51%	875	49%	1,776	100%

Projected Po	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Sedgwick County Regional Office, 2009										
		Ma	ale	Fen	nale	То	Total				
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
Sedgwick	0 to 3	36	52%	33	48%	69	11%				
	3 to 5	36	51%	34	49%	70	11%				
	5 to 6	14	50%	14	50%	28	5%				
	6 to 13	120	55%	99	45%	219	35%				
	13 to 18	71	47%	81	53%	152	25%				
	18 to 21	48	61%	31	39%	79	13%				
Total	0 to 21	325	53%	292	47%	617	100%				

Projected Po	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Summit County Regional Office, 2009										
			ale	Fen	nale	Total					
		N	% of Males in Age group	Ν	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
Summit	0 to 3	526	51%	501	49%	1,027	16%				
	3 to 5	349	51%	333	49%	682	10%				
	5 to 6	188	51%	179	49%	367	6%				
	6 to 13	1,172	51%	1,108	49%	2,280	35%				
	13 to 18	819	56%	641	44%	1,460	22%				
	18 to 21	385	53%	343	47%	728	11%				
Total	0 to 21	3,439	53%	3,105	47%	6,544	100%				

Projected Pop	ulation by Age	Group in Ye	ars for Telle	r County Re	gional Office	, 2009	
		Ma	ale	Female		Total	
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)						
Teller	0 to 3	339	51%	323	49%	662	12%
	3 to 5	232	51%	221	49%	453	8%
	5 to 6	116	51%	111	49%	227	4%
	6 to 13	942	52%	880	48%	1,822	32%
	13 to 18	762	51%	740	49%	1,502	26%
	18 to 21	543	52%	492	48%	1,035	18%
Total	0 to 21	2,934	51%	2,767	49%	5,701	100%

Projected Pop	oulation by Age	Group in Yea	ars for Wash	nington Cour	nty Regional	Office, 2009	9	
		Ma	ale	Fen	Female		Total	
		Ν	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total	
County	Age Group (Years)							
Washington	0 to 3	68	51%	65	49%	133	11%	
	3 to 5	48	52%	45	48%	93	8%	
	5 to 6	24	52%	22	48%	46	4%	
	6 to 13	205	51%	194	49%	399	34%	
	13 to 18	175	54%	149	46%	324	28%	
	18 to 21	96	55%	78	45%	174	15%	
Total	0 to 21	616	53%	553	47%	1,169	100%	

Projected Pop	Projected Population by Age Group in Years for Weld County Regional Office, 2009										
	Male		ale	Fen	nale	Total					
		N	% of Males in Age group	N	% of Females in Age group	N	% of Total				
County	Age Group (Years)										
Weld	0 to 3	6,398	51%	6,098	49%	12,496	15%				
	3 to 5	4,244	51%	4,058	49%	8,302	10%				
	5 to 6	2,219	51%	2,125	49%	4,344	5%				
	6 to 13	13,841	51%	13,333	49%	27,174	32%				
	13 to 18	9,108	52%	8,567	48%	17,675	21%				
	18 to 21	6,849	49%	7,267	51%	14,116	17%				
Total	0 to 21	42,659	51%	41,448	49%	84,107	100%				

Projected Pop	ulation by Age	Group in Ye	ears for Yum	a County Re	egional Office	e, 2009	
		Ma	ale	Fen	nale	То	tal
		N	% of Males in Age	N	% of Females in	N	% of Total
County	Age Group (Years)		group		Age group		
Yuma	0 to 3	226	51%	214	49%	440	15%
	3 to 5	148	51%	140	49%	288	10%
	5 to 6	78	51%	74	49%	152	5%
	6 to 13	471	48%	505	52%	976	33%
	13 to 18	336	49%	353	51%	689	23%
	18 to 21	204	51%	198	49%	402	14%
Total	0 to 21	1,463	50%	1,484	50%	2,947	100%

Source: State Demography Office, Colorado Department of Local Affairs. http://www.dola.state.co.us/demog_webapps/population_age_gender Retrieved January 20, 2010

Population of all Colorado Children by Race/Ethnicity Multi-County Regional Offices

	Pop	oulation	by Race	for No	rtheast F	Regiona	Office,	2008						
	Logan		Mor	gan	Phil	lips	Sedg	wick	Washi	ngton	Yur	ma	Tota	als
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Race														
White	19,767	95%	26,771	96%	4,363	97%	2,279	97%	4,420	98%	9,518	98%	67118	96%
Black or African American	628	3%	288	1%	9	0%	16	1%	2	0%	15	0%	958	1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	172	1%	330	1%	43	1%	5	0%	36	1%	41	0%	627	1%
Asian	94	0%	88	0%	17	0%	22	1%	4	0%	10	0%	235	0%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	19	0%	58	0%	5	0%	6	0%	1	0%	3	0%	92	0%
Two or More Races	225	1%	269	1%	40	1%	26	1%	34	1%	82	1%	676	1%
Total	20,905	100%	27,804	100%	4,477	100%	2,354	100%	4,497	100%	9,669	100%	69,706	100%

Population by Ethnicity for Northeast Regional Office, 2008														
	Logan Morgan Phillips Sedgwick Washington Yuma Totals										als			
	Ν	%	Z	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Z	%	N	%
Ethnicity														
Hispanic or Latino	3,032	15%	9,599	35%	856	19%	365	16%	403	9%	2,059	21%	16,314	23%

Population by Race for Northwest Regional Office, 2008														
	Grand		Jack	son	Mot	ffat	Rio B	lanco	Ro	utt	Tot	als		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Race														
White	13,302	97%	1,314	98%	13,318	96%	6,126	97%	22,315	97%	56,375	97%		
Black or African American	134	1%	5	0%	69	0%	29	0%	128	1%	365	1%		
American Indian or Alaska Native	73	1%	14	1%	154	1%	75	1%	112	0%	428	1%		
Asian	125	1%	1	0%	83	1%	23	0%	160	1%	392	1%		
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	12	0%	0	0%	4	0%	0	0%	18	0%	34	0%		
Two or More Races	135	1%	12	1%	212	2%	87	1%	247	1%	693	1%		
Total	13,781	100%	1,346	100%	13,840	100%	6,340	100%	22,980	100%	58,287	100%		

Population by Ethnicity for Northwest Regional Office, 2008													
	Grand Jackson Moffat Rio Blanco Routt Tot									als			
	N	%	N % N % N % N					%	Ν	%			
Ethnicity													
Hispanic or Latino	730	5%	124	9%	2,019	15%	463	7%	1,020	4%	4,356	7%	

	Population by Race for South Central Regional Office, 2008														
	Alamosa		Cha	ffee	Con	ejos	Cos	tilla	Cus	ster	Frem	nont			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Race															
White	14,105	91%	16,144	95%	7,755	96%	2,953	91%	3,881	97%	42,836	91%			
Black or African American	253	2%	300	2%	28	0%	34	1%	14	0%	2,563	5%			
American Indian or Alaska Native	531	3%	222	1%	179	2%	123	4%	43	1%	781	2%			
Asian	182	1%	98	1%	19	0%	29	1%	16	0%	288	1%			
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	34	0%	8	0%	6	0%	14	0%	0	0%	26	0%			
Two or More Races	312	2%	223	1%	80	1%	79	2%	45	1%	789	2%			
Total	15,417	100%	16,995	100%	8,067	100%	3,232	100%	3,999	100%	47,283	100%			

Population by Ethnicity for South Central Regional Office, 2008													
	Alamosa Chaffee Conejos Costilla Custer Fremo										nont		
	N	%	N	%	Ν	%	N	%	Ν	%	N	%	
Ethnicity													
Hispanic or Latino	6,749	44%	1,578	9%	4,491	56%	2,029	63%	147	4%	5,024	11%	

F	opulation b	y Race for	South Cent	tral Region	al Office, 20	008 (contin	ued)			
	La	ıke	Mine	eral	Rio G	rande	Sagu	ache	То	tal
	N	N %		%	N	%	Ν	%	N	%
Race										
White	7,644	96%	936	97%	11,056	95%	6,755	96%	114,065	93%
Black or African American	21	0%	0	0%	83	1%	11	0%	3,307	3%
American Indian or Alaska Native	164	2%	8	1%	275	2%	161	2%	2,487	2%
Asian	54	1%	0	0%	41	0%	33	0%	760	1%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	8	0%	0	0%	8	0%	4	0%	108	0%
Two or More Races	103	1%	18	2%	154	1%	94	1%	1,897	2%
Total	7,994	100%	962	100%	11,617	100%	7,058	100%	122,624	100%

Population by Ethnicity for South Central Regional Office, 2008 (continued)													
	La	ke	Min	eral	Rio G	rande	Sagu	ache	To	tal			
	N	%	N	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	N	%			
Ethnicity													
Hispanic or Latino	3,388	42%	23	2%	4,517	39%	3,250	46%	31,196	25%			

	Рори	lation by	Race for	Southwe	est Regio	nal Office	, 2008					
	Archuleta		Dolo	ores	La P	lata	Monte	zuma	San	Juan	To	tal
	N	%	Ν	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Race												
White	12,165	96%	1,897	96%	45,486	90%	21,130	83%	539	98%	81,217	89%
Black or African American	60	0%	1	0%	328	1%	132	1%	0	0%	521	1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	208	2%	54	3%	3,373	7%	3,491	14%	7	1%	7,133	8%
Asian	44	0%	8	0%	349	1%	94	0%	2	0%	497	1%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	3	0%	1	0%	27	0%	29	0%	3	1%	63	0%
Two or More Races	168	1%	25	1%	919	2%	508	2%	1	0%	1,621	2%
Total	12,648	100%	1,986	100%	50,482	100%	25,384	100%	552	100%	91,052	100%

Population by Ethnicity for Southwest Regional Office, 2008												
	Archuleta Dolores La Plata Montezuma San Juan Total											tal
	N	%	N	%	Ν	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Ethnicity												
Hispanic or Latino	2,055	16%	105	5%	5,432	11%	2,459	10%	60	11%	10,111	11%

	Population	on by Race	for Southe	east Region	nal Office, 2	2008				
	Baca		Ве	ent	Chey	enne	Cro	wley	Kio	wa
	N	N %		%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Race										
White	3,688	96%	5,167	88%	1,712	98%	5,372	85%	1,281	97%
Black or African American	2	0%	411	7%	11	1%	622	10%	8	1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	57	1%	178	3%	19	1%	198	3%	22	2%
Asian	10	0%	47	1%	0	0%	70	1%	2	0%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	4	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%
Two or More Races	73	2%	99	2%	7	0%	69	1%	7	1%
Total	3,834	100%	5,902	100%	1,749	100%	6,332	100%	1,321	100%

	Population	by Ethnic	ity for Sout	heast Regi	onal Office	, 2008						
Baca Bent Cheyenne Crowley Kiowa												
	N % N % N % N %											
Ethnicity												
Hispanic or Latino 361 9% 1,933 33% 185 11% 1,518 24% 68 5%												

Pop	ulation by	Race for S	outheast Re	egional Off	ice, 2008 (continued)				
	Kit Ca	arson	Linc	oln	Ote	ero	Prov	vers	Total	
	N	N %		%	Ν	%	N	%	N	%
Race										
White	7,423	95%	4,780	90%	17,620	94%	12,549	96%	59,592	93%
Black or African American	288	4%	311	6%	229	1%	66	1%	1,948	3%
American Indian or Alaska Native	53	1%	69	1%	394	2%	252	2%	1,242	2%
Asian	29	0%	46	1%	164	1%	88	1%	456	1%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	4	0%	4	0%	33	0%	13	0%	60	0%
Two or More Races	46	1%	76	1%	334	2%	148	1%	859	1%
Total	7,843	100%	5,286	100%	18,774	100%	13,116	100%	64,157	100%

Рорг	ulation by E	thnicity for	Southeast	Regional C	office, 2008	(continued	d)				
	Kit Ca	arson	Lind	coln	Ote	ero	Prov	wers	To	tal	
	N	N O N O N O									
Ethnicity											
Hispanic or Latino	1,528 19% 595 11% 7,396 39% 4,998 38% 18,582 29%										

	Popula	tion by Rac	e for Tri-C	ounty Region	onal Office,	2008				
	Ada	ıms	Arap	ahoe	Dou	glas	Elbert		To	tal
	N	N %		%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Race										
White	386,843	90%	455,390	82%	259,072	92%	21,992	96%	1,123,297	87%
Black or African American	15,089	4%	54,460	10%	5,300	2%	257	1%	75,106	6%
American Indian or Alaska Native	5,874	1%	4,701	1%	1,383	0%	146	1%	12,104	1%
Asian	14,145	3%	25,025	5%	9,908	4%	151	1%	49,229	4%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	724	0%	956	0%	173	0%	19	0%	1,872	0%
Two or More Races	8,161	2%	13,750	2%	4,785	2%	364	2%	27,060	2%
Total	430,836	100%	554,282	100%	280,621	100%	22,929	100%	1,288,668	100%

	Population	on by Ethni	city for Tri-0	County Reg	gional Offic	e, 2008					
Adams Arapahoe Douglas Elbert Total											
	N % N % N % N %										
Ethnicity											
Hispanic or Latino	153,577 36% 98,038 18% 20,312 7% 1,247 5% 273,174 21%										

	Po	pulation by	Race for \	Nestern Slo	pe Office,	2008				
	Eag	gle	Gar	field	Gunr	nison	Hinsdale		Me	sa
	N %		Ν	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Race										
White	50,633	97%	53,309	96%	14,548	96%	819	98%	136,833	96%
Black or African American	304	1%	588	1%	113	1%	0	0%	1,450	1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	386	1%	484	1%	160	1%	15	2%	1,600	1%
Asian	567	1%	295	1%	118	1%	2	0%	1,006	1%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	39	0%	37	0%	5	0%	0	0%	157	0%
Two or More Races	402	1%	713	1%	203	1%	4	0%	2,125	1%
Total	52,331	100%	55,426	100%	15,147	100%	840	100%	143,171	100%

	Popul	ation by Et	hnicity for V	Vestern Slo	pe Office,	2008					
Eagle Garfield Gunnison Hinsdale Mesa											
	N % N % N % N %										
Ethnicity											
Hispanic or Latino	14,915 29% 13,834 25% 959 6% 12 1% 17,313 12%										

	Popula	ation by R	ace for V	Vestern S	lope Offic	ce, 2008 (continue	d)				
	Mont	rose	Ou	ray	Pitl	kin	San M	liguel	Sum	nmit	Tot	al
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Race												
White	38,749	96%	4,427	97%	14,968	97%	7,304	97%	25,883	96%	347,473	96%
Black or African American	294	1%	5	0%	100	1%	21	0%	279	1%	3,154	1%
American Indian or Alaska Native	580	1%	39	1%	42	0%	67	1%	159	1%	3,532	1%
Asian	254	1%	13	0%	209	1%	67	1%	255	1%	2,786	1%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	35	0%	2	0%	6	0%	6	0%	23	0%	310	0%
Two or More Races	627	2%	74	2%	149	1%	87	1%	244	1%	4,628	1%
Total	40,539	100%	4,560	100%	15,474	100%	7,552	100%	26,843	100%	361,883	100%

F	Population Population	n by Ethn	icity for W	Vestern Sl	ope Offic	e, 2008 (continued	d)				
	Mont	rose	Ou	ray	Pitl	kin	San M	1iguel	Sun	nmit	То	tal
	Z	%	Z	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%
Ethnicity												
Hispanic or Latino	7,117	18%	255	6%	1,379	9%	679	9%	3,825	14%	60,288	17%

		Population	on by Ra	ce for Jef	ferson O	ffice, 200	18					
	Broon	nfield	Clear	Creek	Gil	pin	Jeffe	rson	Pa	ark	Tot	tal
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Race												
White	50,286	92%	8,491	95%	4,913	95%	494,921	93%	16,346	96%	574,957	93%
Black or African American	688	1%	91	1%	27	1%	8,647	2%	132	1%	9,585	2%
American Indian or Alaska Native	404	1%	90	1%	43	1%	5,515	1%	155	1%	6,207	1%
Asian	2,525	5%	72	1%	65	1%	13,947	3%	85	1%	16,694	3%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	18	0%	4	0%	9	0%	721	0%	4	0%	756	0%
Two or More Races	937	2%	160	2%	96	2%	9,588	2%	271	2%	11,052	2%
Total	54,858	100%	8,908	100%	5,153	100%	533,339	100%	16,993	100%	619,251	100%

	Po	pulation b	y Ethnic	ity for Jef	ferson Ot	fice, 2008	3					
Broomfield Clear Creek Gilpin Jefferson Park Total												
	Ν	%	N	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%
Ethnicity												
Hispanic or Latino	6,335	12%	471	5%	284	6%	75,488	14%	943	6%	83,521	13%

	Populatio	n by Race for El F	Paso Office, 2008			
	El P	aso	То	tal		
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Race						
White	507,705	85%	20,470	95%	528,175	86%
Black or African American	41,886	7%	302	1%	42,188	7%
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,008	1%	261	1%	7,269	1%
Asian	18,316	3%	171	1%	18,487	3%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1,805	0%	16	0%	1,821	0%
Two or More Races	19,333	3%	441	2%	19,774	3%
Total	596,053	100%	21,661	100%	617,714	100%

Population by Ethnicity for El Paso Office, 2008						
	El Paso Teller Total					tal
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Ethnicity						
Hispanic or Latino	81,082	14%	1,114	5%	82,196	13%

Population by Race for Las Animas/Huerfano Office, 2008						
	Las Animas		Huerfano		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Race						
White	7,152	90%	14,876	93%	22,028	92%
Black or African American	289	4%	246	2%	535	2%
American Indian or Alaska Native	273	3%	507	3%	780	3%
Asian	41	1%	110	1%	151	1%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	6	0%	34	0%	40	0%
Two or More Races	177	2%	275	2%	452	2%
Total	7,938	100%	16,048	100%	23,986	100%

Population by Ethnicity for Las Animas/Huerfano Office, 2008						
	Las Animas		Huerfano		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Ethnicity						
Hispanic or Latino	2,704	34%	6,533	41%	9,237	39%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, county population estimates – characteristics County Population by Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2000 through July 1, 2008 File: 7/1/2008 County Characteristics Resident Population Estimates File, http://www.census.gov/popest/counties/asrh/CC-EST2008-RACE6.html

Release Date: May 14, 2009

Population By Race/Ethnicity for all Colorado Children for Single County Regional Offices

Population by Race for Boulder County, 2008				
	Bould	Boulder		
	N	%		
Race				
White	271,191	93%		
Black or African American	3,453	1%		
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,225	1%		
Asian	11,199	4%		
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	203	0%		
Two or More Races	4,890	2%		
Total	293,161	100%		

Population by Ethnicity for Boulder County, 2008				
	Bould	er		
	N	%		
Ethnicity				
Hispanic or Latino	39,355	13%		

Population by Race for Delta County, 2008				
	Delta	Delta		
	N	%		
Race				
White	29,776	96%		
Black or African American	219	1%		
American Indian or Alaska Native	270	1%		
Asian	159	1%		
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	15	0%		
Two or More Races	484	2%		
Total	30,923	100%		

Population by Ethnicity for Delta County, 2008		
	Delta	à
	N	%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic or Latino	4,137	13%

Population by Race for Denver County, 2008				
	Denve	Denver		
	N	%		
Race				
White	497,130	83%		
Black or African American	59,923	10%		
American Indian or Alaska Native	8,208	1%		
Asian	20,257	3%		
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1,399	0%		
Two or More Races	11,790	2%		
Total	598,707	100%		

Population by Ethnicity for Denver County, 2008		
	Denv	er
	N	%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic or Latino	205,288	34%

Population by Race for Larimer County, 2008			
	Larimer		
	N %		
Race			
White	276,732	95%	
Black or African American	3,270	1%	
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,282	1%	
Asian	5,306	2%	
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	263	0%	
Two or More Races	4,972	2%	
Total	292,825	100%	

Population by Ethnicity for Larimer County, 2008				
	Larim	er		
	N	%		
Ethnicity				
Hispanic or Latino	29,378	10%		

Population by Race for Pueblo County, 2008				
	Pueb	Pueblo		
	N	%		
Race				
White	145,622	93%		
Black or African American	3,985	3%		
American Indian or Alaska Native	3,121	2%		
Asian	1,293	1%		
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	164	0%		
Two or More Races	2,552	2%		
Total	156,737	100%		

Population by Ethnicity for Pueblo County, 2008				
	Pueb	lo		
	N	%		
Ethnicity				
Hispanic or Latino	61,357	39%		

Population by Race for Weld County, 2008				
	Weld	Weld		
	N	%		
Race				
White	237,628	95%		
Black or African American	2,732	1%		
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,460	1%		
Asian	3,183	1%		
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	269	0%		
Two or More Races	3,503	1%		
Total	249,775	100%		

Population by Ethnicity for Weld County, 2008		
	Weld	k
	N	%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic or Latino	68,482	27%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, county population estimates – characteristics County Population by Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2000 through July 1, 2008 File: 7/1/2008 County Characteristics Resident Population Estimates File, http://www.census.gov/popest/counties/asrh/CC-EST2008-RACE6.html, Release Date: May 14, 2009

Colorado Children's Public Health Insurance



Public Health Insurance provides a source of payment for many children with special health care needs. Having county Medicaid data is helpful when planning and assessing the effectiveness of Medicaid enrollment and referrals to and from EPSDT.

Updated data for the number and percent of children ages 0-18 who are eligible but not enrolled in Medicaid, CHP+, and Medicaid or CHP+ by county are not available from the Colorado Department of Health Care Policy and Finance (HCPF) at the time this report was prepared. These data were previously reported in the HCP Annual 2009 Data Report and were obtained from an issue brief produced by the Colorado Health Institute.

Medicaid Enrolled Children by County 10/01/2008 to 9/30/2009

County	Client Count
ADAMS	49,436
ALAMOSA	2,383
ARAPAHOE	42,905
ARCHULETA	964
BACA	368
BENT	654
BOULDER	13,902
BROOMFIELD	1,999
CHAFFEE	942
CHEYENNE	138
CLEAR CREEK	388
CONEJOS	1,206
COSTILLA	464
CROWLEY	453
CUSTER	274
DELTA	2,719
DENVER	67,400
DOLORES	142
DOUGLAS	5,769
EAGLE	2,655
EL PASO	46,278
ELBERT	955
FREMONT	3,749
GARFIELD	4,572
GILPIN	235
GRAND	639
GUNNISON	666
HINSDALE	38
HUERFANO	810
JACKSON	98
JEFFERSON	25,795
KIOWA	122

County	Client Count
KIT CARSON	724
LA PLATA	3,014
LAKE	811
LARIMER	16,934
LAS ANIMAS	1,679
LINCOLN	506
LOGAN	1,742
MESA	13,115
MINERAL	38
MOFFAT	1,289
MONTEZUMA	2,927
MONTROSE	4,422
MORGAN	3,253
OTERO	2,712
OURAY	174
PARK	719
PHILLIPS	360
PITKIN	200
PROWERS	2,050
PUEBLO	20,322
RIO BLANCO	485
RIO GRANDE	1,776
ROUTT	776
SAGUACHE	837
SAN JUAN	53
SAN MIGUEL	271
SEDGWICK	191
SUMMIT	1,194
TELLER	1,406
WASHINGTON	348
WELD	24,475
YUMA	977

Medicaid and SSI Data are from the Colorado Department of Health Care Policy and Finance, accessed February 2010.

Medicaid and SSI Enrolled Children by County 10/01/2008 to 9/30/2009

County	Client Count
ADAMS	1,220
ALAMOSA	65
ARAPAHOE	1,550
ARCHULETA	DS
BACA	DS
BENT	DS
BOULDER	436
BROOMFIELD	81
CHAFFEE	32
CHEYENNE	DS
CLEAR CREEK	DS
CONEJOS	DS
COSTILLA	DS
CROWLEY	DS
CUSTER	DS
DELTA	70
DENVER	1,841
DOLORES	DS
DOUGLAS	328
EAGLE	42
EL PASO	2,121
ELBERT	DS
FREMONT	164
GARFIELD	73
GILPIN	DS
GRAND	DS
GUNNISON	DS
HINSDALE	DS
HUERFANO	DS
JACKSON	DS
JEFFERSON	1,053
KIOWA	DS

County	Client Count
KIT CARSON	DS
LA PLATA	70
LAKE	DS
LARIMER	559
LAS ANIMAS	63
LINCOLN	DS
LOGAN	60
MESA	408
MINERAL	DS
MOFFAT	DS
MONTEZUMA	77
MONTROSE	129
MORGAN	70
OTERO	109
OURAY	DS
PARK	DS
PHILLIPS	DS
PITKIN	DS
PROWERS	67
PUEBLO	822
RIO BLANCO	DS
RIO GRANDE	55
ROUTT	DS
SAGUACHE	DS
SAN JUAN	DS
SAN MIGUEL	DS
SEDGWICK	DS
SUMMIT	DS
TELLER	49
WASHINGTON	DS
WELD	638
YUMA	DS

^{*}DS indicates data are suppressed for confidentiality when the value is less than 30.

Eligibility figures represent 001-011 and 020 (see table below). Counts of clients are distinct within county or program. However, totals may not represent unique clients. Example: if a client moves to another county within the time frame, they will be counted twice. All clients who are enrolled in Medicaid are eligible for EPSDT. Therefore, the breakdown of children 20 years of age or under eligible for Medicaid is identical to the breakdown of these same clients on EPSDT.


Eligibility Type	Eligibility Type Description	Client Count
011	SLMB	3
002	OAP-B-SSI	2
010	QMB Only	11
008	BC Children	255,076
003	ANS/AB-SSI	12,716
004	AFDC/CWP Adults	7,841
009	Non-Citizens (Emergency)	1,852
007	BC Women	1,877
006	Foster Care	23,343
005	AFDC/CWP Children	167,661

Medicaid and SSI Data are from the Colorado Department of Health Care Policy and Finance, February 2010.

Colorado Children's Health Access Program (CCHAP) Provider Data

The Colorado Children's Health Access Program (CCHAP) partners with the Medicaid Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT) Program and Family Voices to provide technical assistance to primary care providers to entice and reward completion of preventive care services for the Medicaid patients they serve. The program started in 2007.

Colorado Counties



Published June 2009

Colorado Children's Health Access Program (CCHAP)

Pink = counties with at least one primary care physician providers PCP) who accepts Medicaid and CHP + and has been working with CCHAP in 2007, 2008, and 2009.

Green = counties who have one primary care physician provider (PCP) who accepts Medicaid and CHP + and is affiliated with CCHAP since the beginning of 2010. More counties will be added in 2010

Blue = counties who are not included in CCHAP outreach efforts unless a primary care provider not practicing in a FQHC or Rural Health Center is identified and is willing to accept Medicaid and CHP + and

FQHC and Rural Health Centers have their own medical home initiative to work with practices. CCHAP is interested in identifying local primary care physician practices, who are willing to accept Medicaid and CHP +, and might be interested in learning more about the practice strategies CCHAP can provide regarding developing their own medical home approach.

HCP Care Coordination

The HCP Care Coordination improves the quality of life for children with special health care needs and their families by improving the family's ability to appropriately and effectively utilize a *medical home team approach* thereby improving quality of life and decreasing health care expenditures. HCP Care Coordination serves children and youth, birth to 21 years of age in all counties of Colorado.

HCP Care Coordinators facilitate access to and coordination of health (physical, mental, and dental) and social support services for children with special health care needs across different providers and organizations. HCP Care Coordinators support and facilitate family participation in health care decisions, communication with health care providers, and coordination of health and community services resulting in their increased knowledge and appropriate utilization of health care resources.

HCP provided HCP Care Coordination Training during 2009 and the start of 2010. Starting April 1, 2010 data for the following indicators will be collected from CHIRP to measure short term outcomes. HCP is receiving consultation from CDPHE evaluators to identify indicators and data sources to measure mid-term outcomes that will be implemented later in 2011.

HCP Care Coordination – Short Term Outcomes:

- 1) A usual source of sick and well care, other than the ER
- 2) A consistent PCP, physician, nurse practitioner, or physician assistant.
- 3) A source of payment for health care services (health insurance of other on going sources of health care)
- 4) Access to needed specialty care
- 5) Access to needed family support services.
- 6) Satisfaction with HCP Care Coordination services

HCP Care Coordination - Mid-Term Outcomes (3-5 years)

- 1) Efficacy to appropriately manage their child's healthcare
- 2) Appropriate health care utilization (usual source of care)
- 3) Family satisfaction with medical care received

HCP Care Coordination - Long Term Outcomes

- 1) Improved quality of life for themselves and their children
- 2) Decrease in health care expenditures



HCP Collaboration for Ease of Systems Use

HCP improves quality of life for families with children with special health care needs by improving "ease of use" and accessibility of community resources and health care referrals through convening and collaborating with community partners and providers, thereby improving community outreach, identification and utilization of resources.

HCP values family participation and leadership when working with community systems. Families and CSHCN represent the consumer voice since they have experienced successes, gaps and barriers when using systems and services.

HCP supports and facilitates family participation in health care decisions, coordination of health and community services and appropriate utilization of health care resources.

HCP is currently receiving consultation from evaluators at Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment to identify indicators and data sources to evaluate system efforts. HCP will be hiring a Systems of Care Program Manager who will develop training, guidance, consultation and technical assistance to assure state and local collaborative relationships are established to implement outcome measures.

HCP has identified the following outcome measures for evaluation of local systems building efforts:

Short Term Outcome Measures:

- 1) Improved outreach and identification of CSHCN
- 2) Effective and consistent interagency collaboration between local level partners
- 3) Increased family utilization of community resources and services

Medium Term Outcome Measures:

- 1) Easy to Use and Accessible Services
- Reduction in number of barriers for families using services (transportation, poor communication, unskilled providers, services not available, eligibility limitations, limited benefits, too much paperwork, and services not available or too costly)

Long Term Outcome Measures:

- 1) Decrease in Health Care Expenditures
- 2) Improved Quality of life for CSHCN and their Families

Note: Reference the Medical Home Action Guide for HCP Strategy #2, Collaboration with Community Partners for Easy to Use Services, www.mchcolorado.org and www.hcpcolorado.org. See listed systems and services for families with CSHCN, example action steps and helpful questions to ask when planning.



Children's Traumatic Brain Injury Trust Fund Program Overview

Delivery of Services

The Health Care Program for Children with Special Needs (HCP) at the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) completed its fifth year as the contractor for children's care coordination services on June 30, 2009, through a contract with Denver Options. HCP resides within the Prevention Services Division at CDPHE.

The TBI program team at HCP consists of:

Program Management:

- TBI Program Manager
- TBI Care Coordination Consultant

In addition, the TBI management team at HCP consists of the HCP Program Director, the HCP Health Services Director, and the HCP Operations Director and provides consultation and oversight to facilitate the integration of the TBI program within HCP.

Care coordination services:

 Statewide system of Public Health Departments (14 regional offices) and County Nursing Services (contracted to provide care coordination services with 45 TBI care coordinators, 26 with active clients)

HCP provided care coordination services to 136 children and youth between July 1, 2008, and June 30, 2009, compared to 134 during the same period in 07/08, and received a total of 66 referrals from BIAC compared to 80 last year. Of the 66 eligible referrals, four families did not pursue the Trust Fund services, and one family decided to defer their care plan until their child is enrolled in school in the fall of this year. Several reasons were given for declining Trust Fund services, including family not ready, family unable to define needs at this time, and family in flux.

Referrals for Care Coordination from BIAC

Youth referrals for the TBI Trust Fund Program decreased by 18% during this reporting period compared to the previous period. At this point, HCP can only speculate on the reason for this drop. HCP has met with the TBI Program Director at the Department of Human Services to express concern over the decrease and has made suggestions to help increase enrollment. Among the ideas suggested were increased community outreach, developing marketing materials and campaigns directly targeting pediatric TBI survivors and families, and increasing school outreach. HCP is working to get the word out about the program throughout the state through care coordinator and program manager involvement in CIRCLE and TNT groups, community coalitions (e.g., Safe Kids), the HCP program, raising primary care provider awareness of the TBI Trust Fund program through the medical home approach, and partnering with families and school personnel to assure our clients' access to appropriate services in the educational setting.

TBI care coordinators actively participate in their local CIRCLE and TNT groups. These care coordinators provide services to TBI clients at Denver Health and Hospital Authority, Tri-County Health Department, Larimer County Department of Public Health and Environment, Jefferson County Department of Health and Environment, and Pueblo City-County Health Department.

Children's Care Coordination

TBI care coordination serves as a model and sets a high standard for care coordination within HCP. The purpose of HCP care coordination is:

"... The facilitation of access to, and coordination of, health related medical (physical, mental, and dental) and social support services for children with special health care needs across different providers and organizations through a medical home approach."

The vision of HCP care coordination is:

"...to improve the quality of life for families with children with special health care needs by improving the family's ability to appropriately and effectively utilize the health care system through referral, education, and coordination of health and community services, thereby decreasing health care expenditures."

TBI care coordination provides the highest level of assistance offered by HCP to families to access health care and community services through a health care plan completed in collaboration with the family.

• Key Elements:

- Completion of the Care Coordination Health Assessment is based on the family's concern and/or the child's health condition/diagnosis to determine both unmet family needs as well as potential unmet needs.
- o Information is shared with the child/youth's primary care provider regarding HCP involvement with the family and child and when care coordination ends.
- Development of a health care plan that addresses the family's concerns and goals and interventions addressing the goals (referrals, education, and services—both acquired without Trust Fund monetary assistance and purchased with Trust Fund monetary assistance).
- o Development of a health care transition plan for youth 14 years of age or older.
- Evaluation of the health care plan goals and extent to which services, education, and referrals have been acquired or completed and whether further care coordination is needed.
- Based on local office capacity, local community funding, and/or contracts to reimburse services.
- o Contacts with families are made with phone calls, e-mail, home visits, clinic visits, and office visits.

Medical Home Approach


A medical home approach requires all professionals involved in a child's care to operate as a team, with families as critical members of that team through education and mentoring, and all team members understand the importance of quality, coordinated medical, mental, and oral health care. ¹

It is a goal of HCP care coordination to promote the medical home approach. To that end, HCP-TBI care coordinators work with the family and the child's primary care provider to understand and be engaged in the utilization of HCP care coordination. TBI care coordinators gather information on the child's medical home during the initial face to face assessment, educate, and mentor the family on how to access needed health care, and provide referrals when appropriate. TBI care coordinators contact primary care providers of TBI clients to inform and educate them about the care coordination provided through the Trust Fund and offer assistance in finding resources for their mutual client. Oftentimes, the primary care provider is not aware of the TBI Trust Fund and the services provided.

1 Watters, Kathy, Director , Children with Special Health Care Needs Unit, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, "The Role of Colorado Public Health Agencies in Building a Medical Home System"


SERVICES PURCHASED

Children's Services





TBI CHILDREN'S CARE COORDINATION


Top Children's Services Purchased




Appendix A: Demographic Data








CLIENTS BY AGE AT REFERRAL



Adult Program



CLIENTS BY LANGUAGE

Children's Program Clients by Primary Language	Number	Percent
English	78	57.4%
Spanish	9	6.6%
Vietnamese	1	0.7%
Hmong	0	0%
Russian	0	0%
Other	0	0%
Unknown	48	35.3%
English, Non-verbal	0	0%
TOTAL	136	100%

Adult Program Clients by Primary Language	Number	Percent
English	574	98.29%
Spanish/English	3	0.51%
Burmese	1	0.17%
Spanish	1	0.17%
Non-Verbal	3	0.51%
Unknown	2	0.34%
TOTAL	584	100%

TBI Quarterly Reports for 4th Quarter of FY09 – Summary Reports

Children's Services

	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter	Non-Duplicative Total (6)
Number of Eligible Individuals referred by BIAC for services (1)	16	16	17	17	58
Number of Individuals who received Care Coordination services (2)	88	85	77	75	136
Number of Individuals who received purchased services (3)	45	46	44	33	105
Number of Individuals on Wait List during period	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Average Length of Time on Wait List (4)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Estimated total value of services acquired through Care Coordination (5)	\$4,679.50	\$4,506.51	\$20,350.00	\$1,335.00	\$30,871.00

*Notes:

- (1) Based on date of fax on referral from BIAC
- (2) Services begin at first care coordination contact with client
- (3) Based on date of service
- (4) Includes only clients who left wait list and began services during the reporting period
- (5) Does not include services the client acquired without the assistance of the care coordinator. Does not include services paid for by the Trust Fund.
- (6) Each individual is counted once, even if he/she was counted in more than one quarter. The Non-Duplicative Total may be less than the sum of the four quarters for some items (e.g. number of individuals who received services).


HCP Pediatric Specialty Clinics

The HCP Pediatric Specialty Clinics are provided in 15 different communities across Colorado. The purpose of these clinics is to:

- Provide access to pediatric specialty care in rural and frontier areas of Colorado.
- 2) Facilitate access to pediatric specialty consultation and collaboration with local primary care providers, public health, schools, early intervention, and other local community agencies.
- 3) Support and model a Medial Home Team Approach in local communities.
- 4) Provide specialty consultation and continuing education to local providers and specialists.

Types of Pediatric Specialty Clinics

- Cardiology
- Neurology
- Orthopedics
- Rehabilitation



HCP Pediatric Specialty Clinic Benchmarks for 2008-2009

The location and number of the Pediatric Specialty Clinics are determined by requests from local communities based on their defined needs as well as state resources to support the clinics. The State HCP Program contracts with specialty providers between July and June each year through an honorarium that supports their time and travel for the clinics. Each clinic location has a designated number of *clinic days* or BENCHMARKS (8 hour clinic) during the year based on their State HCP Program contract.

Region	Clinic Sites	Clinic Type	Provider	Benchmarks
g.c.r				2008- 2009
Larimer	Fort Collins	Neurology	UPI Moe	4
		, to an one gy	0.100	
Northeast	Sterling	Neurology	UPI Miller	6
	l l	Orthorpedics	UPI Chang/Georgopoulos	4
		Rehab	UPI Wilson	2
		Sub Total	0.111001.	12
		ous rota.		
Pueblo	Pueblo	Neurology	UPI Miller	8
. 405.0	l desie	Ortho	UPI Erickson	2
		Rehab	UPI Wilson	4
		Sub Total	OT T TTILOGIT	14
		Gub i Gtai		
South Central	Alamosa: Alamo	Neurology	Reiley	10
John John M		Rehab	UPI Oaleszek	4
	<u> </u>	Sub Total	OT T CAICSZON	14
	 	Oub Total		17
	Chafee: Buena Vista	Neurology	Seay	3
	Charee. Buena Vista	Neurology	Jeay	J
South East	Otero:Rocky Ford	Pediatrics	Stage	4
South Last	Otero: La Junta	Rehab	UPI Oleszek	2
	Otero. La Junta	Subtotal	OF1 Oleszek	6
		Subiolai		O
	Prowers: Lamar	Moureleau	Coov	4
	Flowers. Lamai	Neurology	Seay	4
South West	La Plata: Durango	Neurology	Reiley	4
South West	La Flata. Durango	Rehab	UPI Matthews	2
		Sub Total	OFTIMALITIEWS	6
•		Sub Total		O
	MontogumorCortog	Moureleau	Doilov	4
	Montezuma:Cortez	Neurology	Reiley	4
	Archuleta:Pagosa Springs	Moureleau	Deiler	4
	Archuleta: Pagosa Springs	Neurology	Reiley	4
Mostorn Clara	Moses Crand Junction	Nourology	LIDI:Moo: Boiloy/Cooy	10
Western Slope	Mesa: Grand Junction	Neurology Rehab	UPI:Moe; Reiley/Seay UPI Gallagher	18 4
			OFI Gallagriel	22
	 	Sub Total		22
	Optical de Clare	0	LIDLE OF #	4
	Garfield: Glenwood Springs	Cardiology	UPI E. Shaffer	4
	 	Neurology	Seay	4
	<u> </u>	Sub Total		8
	Bandana	Name	0	_
	Montrose	Neurology	Seay	4
		ļ., .	1	
Delta	Delta: Delta	Neurology	Seay	4
		Ortho	Winkler	2
		Sub Total		6
TOTAL				111

Diagnostic and Evaluation (D&E) Clinics



The purpose of the D&E Clinics is to provide families access to evaluation services within or near their own community. A team of professionals work to provide a comprehensive diagnostic medical evaluation of a child with suspected special needs. D&E teams typically include a developmental pediatrician along with related service professionals. Related service professionals might include: speech language pathologists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, social workers, psychologists, service coordinators, parent advocates and nurses.

The D&E Clinic Program ascribes to the philosophy that services must be community-based, family-centered and culturally competent. These three concepts are the core values of the D&E Clinic Program. There are eight clinics found throughout the state that serve a broader community base as each clinic site is encouraged to regionalize their efforts for children outside their immediate community.

The clinic sites are in the following counties: Otero, Pueblo, El Paso, Fremont, Weld, Denver, La Plata and Mesa. The data provides the number of children who attended one of these D&E Clinics during the fiscal year, October 1, 2008 through September 30, 2009 as compared with October 1, 2007 - September 30, 2008.

The primary diagnosis identified by these clinics is Communication Expressive/Receptive Delays. The two other significant diagnoses are Social Emotional Mental Health Issues and Developmental Delays. We know that children identified early need services provided that potentially mitigate the need for more expansive and costly services for children as they grow. Communities use this knowledge to identify unmet needs i.e. speech and language, mental health services, community resources and services specific to the needs of these children.

Number of Children Seen by D&E Clinic Site

	2008-2009	2007-2008
Arkansas Valley (Rocky Ford)	10	11
Children's Developmental Clinic (Colorado Springs)	173	112
Children's D&E Clinic (Durango)	16	14
Mesa School District (Grand Junction)	6	8
Northern Colorado Medical Center (Greeley)	0	2
Pueblo Autism Clinic (Dr. Ehrhardt)	17	28
Sewall D&E Clinic (Denver)	161	123
Upper Arkansas Clinic (Fremont County)	7	4
Total Children Seen	390	302

Additional Data for Children seen in D&E Clinics

Gender	2008-2009	2007-2008
Male	263	194
Female	120	101
Not Entered	7	7


Age	2008-2009	2007-2008
<3	61	77
3-5 yrs	158	101
6-21 yrs	166	125

Race/Ethnicity	2008-2009	2007-2008
Caucasion	197	166
Hispanic	107	73
African American	32	21
Asian/Pacific Islander	2	2
Native American	10	11
Multiracial	27	22
Other	43	10


Referral Sources	2008-2009	2007-2008
Child Find	1	0
Part C	3	10
PCP	62	57
Schoool Personnel	20	25
Public Health	4	7
Parent/Family	93	52
Child Care Provider	5	0
Social Services	4	121
Mental Health	59	6
Other	132	24

Insurance Type	2008-2009	2007-2008
Medicaid	320	255
CHP+	6	3
Private HMO	5	3
Private Other	16	20
None	13	18


Referral Sources for Children seen in D&E Clinics, 2008-2009



Age Comparison of Children seen in D&E Clinics for 2007-2008 and 2008-2009



Comparison of Insurance for children seen in D&E Clinics for 2007-2008 and 2008-2009



Data Source: D&E Clinic Sites, Annual Report, 2008 and 2009

Newborn Hearing Screening



Newborn hearing screening data is sent from birthing hospitals to the Office of Vital Statistics at the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment via the electronic birth certificate (EBC). A daily extract of the EBC data is sent to the Newborn Hearing Screening CHIRP electronic record for newborns who either miss or fail an initial hearing screen. A monthly report of these missed/failed screens is then generated from the Newborn Hearing Screening CHIRP and sent to a designated Hospital Hearing Screening Coordinator who provides information on rescreen results.

Colorado's goals are to screen 98% of all newborns, keep the "refer rate" (or number of children who fail the initial screen) around 4%, and follow-up on at least 85% of infants who fail their initial screen.

In an attempt to increase the state's percentages for hearing screening follow-up, regional Early Hearing Detection and Intervention (EHDI) teams are being established throughout Colorado. Each EHDI team will be comprised of the local Audiology Regional Coordinator, the county Healthcare Program for Children with Special Needs Team Leader(s), the regional Colorado Hearing Resource Coordinator (CO-Hear), a local parent of a child with hearing loss involved with the Hands & Voices support group, local birth hospital coordinator(s), and other key stakeholders in the community. The teams will provide training and support for each birthing hospital and identify and address potential gaps and solutions specific to each community. One such solution is the Roadmap for Families. The Roadmaps have been customized for each hospital and define the rescreening process and direct the families and providers to the nearest audiologist who can assess infants having the recommended equipment and expertise.


Colora	do Newborn l					th by Coun	ty
				12/31/2008			
	Children	Chile	dren	Children w		Children wh	
	Born	Scre	ened	Scree	ning	Follow Up 3	Screening
County	N	N	%	N	%	N	%
ADAMS	7,785	7,695	98.8%	288	3.7%	237	82.39
ALAMOSA	269	266	98.9%	17	6.4%	6	35.39
ARAPAHOE	8,145	8,027	98.6%	251	3.1%	203	80.99
ARCHULETA BACA	117 28	109 28	93.2% 100.0%	4 6	3.7% 21.4%	4	100.09 66.79
BENT	65	62	95.4%	10	16.1%	7	70.09
BOULDER	3,191	3,078	96.5%	154	5.0%	135	87.79
BROOMFIELD	741	729	98.4%	32	4.4%	31	96.9
CHAFFEE	129	122	94.6%	3	2.5%	3	100.0
CHEYENNE	27	26	96.3%	DS	7.7%	DŚ	50.0
CLEAR CREEK	85	83	97.6%	DS	1.2%	DS	100.0
CONEJOS	115	113	98.3%	3	2.7%	DS	66.7
COSTILLA CROWLEY	30	29	96.7%	DS	6.9%	DS	100.0
CUSTER	30	30 24	100.0% 92.3%	4 0	13.3% 0.0%	DS N/A	50.0 N/
DELTA	346	332	96.0%	22	6.6%	21	95.5
DENVER	10,162	9,979	98.2%	335	3.4%	287	85.7
DOLORES	29	28	96.6%	DS	3.6%	DS	100.0
DOUGLAS	3,853	3,784	98.2%	62	1.6%	50	80.6
EAGLE	893	874	97.9%	41	4.7%	30	73.2
EL PASO	8,649	8,377	96.9%	461	5.5%	338	73.3
ELBERT	177	172	97.2%	5	2.9%	DS	60.0
FREMONT	427	424	99.3%	54	12.7%	42	77.8
GARFIELD	983	958	97.5%	21	2.2%	18	85.7
GILPIN	58	56	96.6%	3	5.4%	DS -	100.0
GRAND	151	141	93.4%	10	7.1%	7	70.0
GUNNISON HINSDALE	179 DS	172 DS	96.1% 85.7%	56 DS	32.6% 16.7%	56 DS	100.0 100.0
HUERFANO	49	48	98.0%	DS	4.2%	DS	100.0
JACKSON	8	8	100.0%	0	0.0%	N/A	N
JEFFERSON	6,024	5,915	98.2%	133	2.2%	94	70.7
KIOWA	17	16	94.1%	DS	6.3%	DS.	100.0
(IT CARSON	79	78	98.7%	DS	2.6%	DS	50.0
_a plata	591	563	95.3%	16	2.8%	12	75.0
_AKE	115	111	96.5%	13	11.7%	6	46.2
ARIMER	3,455	3,359	97.2%	155	4.6%	142	91.6
_AS ANIMAS	132	128	97.0%	13	10.2%	11	84.6
INCOLN	55 234	51 233	92.7% 99.6%	7	7.8% 3.0%	DS 6	50.0
<u>-OGAN</u> MESA	1,991	1,920	99.6%	64	3.0%	54	85.7 84.4
MINERAL	1,991 DS	1,920 DS	100.0%	DS	20.0%	DS DS	100.0
MOFFAT	208	203	97.6%	16	7.9%	7	43.8
MONTEZUMA	305	291	95.4%	12	4.1%	11	91.7
MONTROSE	564	552	97.9%	20	3.6%	18	90.0
MORGAN	465	460	98.9%	25	5.4%	23	92.0
OTERO	260	256	98.5%	40	15.6%	26	65.0
DURAY	31	27	87.1%	DS	3.7%	DS	100.0
PARK	148	142	95.9%	3	2.1%	3	100.0
PHILLIPS	47	46	97.9%	3	6.5%	DS	66.7
PITKIN	168	159	94.6%	3	1.9%	DS	33.3
PROWERS PUEBLO	193	189	97.9%	26	13.8%	19	73.1
	2,104 92	2,076 89	98.7% 96.7%	158 4	7.6% 4.5%	133 N/A	84.2 N
RIO BLANCO RIO GRANDE	152	151	99.3%	8	5.3%	1N/A 4	50.0
ROUTT	257	242	94.2%	19	7.9%	12	63.2
SAGUACHE	58	52	89.7%	4	7.7%	4	100.0
SAN JUAN	6	5	83.3%	0	0.0%	N/A	N.
SAN MIGUEL	108	101	93.5%	DS	2.0%	DS	100.0
SEDGWICK	22	22	100.0%	DS	4.5%	N/A	N
SUMMIT	382	365	95.5%	37	10.1%	25	67.6
ELLER	196	183	93.4%	9	4.9%	7	77.8
JNKNOWN	118	101	85.6%	DS	2.0%	DŚ	50.0
WASHINGTON	50	49	98.0%	DS	2.0%	N/A	N 05.6
WELD	3,895	3,842	98.6%	122	3.2%	104	85.2
YUMA	151	149	98.7%	10	6.7%	5	50.0
TOTAL	20 122	07.044	AT 661	0.500	4 404	0.00	
OTAL	69,432	67,911	97.8%	2,786	4.1%	2,235	80.2

Universal Screening is for all Colorado Newborns. This data does not indicate a hearing loss. DS=if less than 3

Family Engagement and Family Leadership Training Initiative (FLTI)

At the national level, there is a significant body of research that indicates that when families are engaged in their child's development, health and education, the result is an increase in achievement and an improvement in overall health and positive behaviors. Colorado is going beyond the concept of family engagement at the individual level by promoting that families are equally valued as partners at the "systems" and policy level. Colorado has begun to conceptualize a continuum that distinguishes the process, progress, and value of family *engagement* at the individual level to family *leadership* at the community and policy level. This progression of family leadership guides our work as we dedicate resources to support individuals at <u>all</u> levels of their development. The progression of family leadership is illustrated by the following model:

PROGRESSION OF FAMILY LEADERSHIP



In 2006, Colorado identified that families have access to programs that support the enhancement of their personal capacity, such as organizing their health records, positive parenting skills and increasing literacy. However, a state-wide scan highlighted a gap in training related to leadership development for parents, youth and the community as a whole. While leadership development courses exist in various professional formats, there are no options for families and youth to refine their leadership skills at the community level.

Following intense research and planning, the Children with Special Health Care Needs Unit, took the lead in offering an innovative initiative to fill this gap. In partnership with the State of Connecticut's Commission on Children, Colorado is now offering a leadership development curriculum known as The Family Leadership Training Institute (FLTI). The curriculum is evidence-based and focuses on developing leadership skills in concert with civic knowledge. Grounded in the concepts of democracy, participants graduate with skills, knowledge and abilities to make effective change in their communities.

In the fall of 2008, two communities in Colorado were approved as pilot sites to offer the FLTI course. These two communities, Adams County and Arapahoe/Douglas Counties began offering the class during the first quarter of 2009. With strong support and leadership from their local Early Childhood Council, these two communities have reported that their charter year of the class was an overwhelming success. The diversity of the class, coupled by the intentional diversity of the facilitation and leadership team, was noted as an indicator of success.

Data from the two pilot sites is limited as we develop a more comprehensive data collection and evaluation plan. It should be noted that the Tri-County Regional Office was the only HCP office directly involved in the 2009 course due to the location of where the classes were offered. The Tri-County RO supported the FLTI effort by encouraging their Family Regional Coordinator to participate as a student in the class, as well as creating a special award to honor an outstanding parent from their area who successfully graduated from the class. This was a special honor for the Tri-County HCP office as this demonstrated their long standing legacy of supporting the development of family leaders.

In the first quarter of 2010, three additional sites have joined the Adams and Arapahoe/Douglas counties in offering the course. The additional communities are; Larimer, Denver and Montezuma/Delores counties. By July 2010, approximately 114 community members will graduate as Family Leaders from the five communities.

While the concepts of family engagement and family leadership have successfully been embedded in cross-sector efforts, the infrastructure continues to evolve at all levels of implementation – local, state and national. Efforts at the State level will continue to support a sustainable infrastructure for family leadership development across all service systems. As a result of the increase in activity related to family leadership development, the "Family Leadership Initiative" has been formally established within the Children with Special Health Care Needs Unit.

2009 Family Leadership Training Initiative Demographic Participant Data

TOTAL 6 (2 6:455)		NI-	0/
TOTALS (2 Sites)		No.	%
TOTAL Class Participants	+	26	
Gender	Women	22	85%
	Men	4	15%
Avg. Age		31.38	
	White	16	62%
Ethnicity	Black	2	8%
	Hispanic	4	15%
	HS	8	31%
	Associates	3	12%
Education	ВА	5	19%
	Masters	3	12%
	PostGrad	1	4%
Marital Status	Single	2	8%
	Married	13	50%
	Divorced	4	15%
	Widow	1	4%
Total Children		48	
Avg Children/Participan	t	1.8	
*Total Special Needs		10	38%
	<\$20K	4	15%
	\$20 - \$39K	6	23%
Household Income	\$40 - \$59K	2	8%
	\$60 - \$85K	4	15%
	\$85K+	5	19%
	Employed FT	8	31%
	Employed PT	4	15%
F	UnEmployed	2	8%
Employment Status	Seasonal	2	8%
	Stay at Home	3	12%
	Otay at 1701110		12/0

Note: Totals may not match due to missing data from 5 participants. * Total Special Needs indicates the number of children represented by the participants taking the course.

Professional Shortage Areas

A Health Professional Shortage Area is a federal designation status of a community that has insufficient primary care, oral health, and/or mental health capacity to meet the needs of the population. A *geographic* designation is created by determining the ratio of providers in direct outpatient care to the population of a health service area that is not living in an institutional setting. A *low income population* designation is created by determining the ratio of providers in direct outpatient care serving patients who are on Medicaid or who are low income and uninsured to the population of a health service area that has incomes below 200% of federal poverty. The ratios to qualify are as follows:

Primary Care Provider Ratios

Geographic Area ≥ 3500:1

Geographic Area with High Needs ≥ 3000:1

- More than 20% of the population has incomes at or below 100% of the Federal Poverty Level; or
- b) More than 100 births per year per 1,000 women ages 15-44; or
- c) More than 20 infant deaths per 1,000 live births; or
- d) Meets insufficient capacity criteria (Appendix 1D)

Population Group ≥ 3000:1

Mental Health Provider Ratios

Geographic Area

- ≥ 1:30,000 psychiatrists, or
- ≥ 1:9,000 core mental health professionals (Appendix 1E), or
- \geq 1:20,000 psychiatrists and \geq 1:6,000 core mental health professionals

Geographic Area with High Needs

- \geq 1:20,000 psychiatrists, or
- ≥ 1:6,000 core mental health professionals, or
- \geq 1:15,000 psychiatrists and \geq 1:4,500 core mental health professionals
- More than 20% of the population has incomes at or below 100% of the Federal Poverty Level; or
- b) A youth ratio of greater than 0.6 (children <18 to adults ages 18-64), or
- c) An elderly ratio of greater than 0.25 (elderly >65 to adults ages 18-64), or
- d) Alcohol or substance abuse prevalence data in the area is in the worst quartile of the nation, state, or region

Population Group

- ≥ 1:20,000 psychiatrists, or
- ≥ 1:6,000 core mental health professionals, or
- \geq 1:15,000 psychiatrists and \geq 1:4,500 core mental health professionals

Not all areas of the state with a shortage currently have a designation. Because a designation must be applied for, and renewed every three years, there are always parts of the state pending review for new or updated designation status.

There are currently 32 federal programs, three state programs, and a growing number of private programs that use shortage designation to either determine eligibility for awards or determine rank of awards by relative need, for granting purposes. Further, providers in active HPSAs may be eligible for increased payments from Medicare and Medicaid. Form more information on the designation process visit: http://www.cdphe.state.co.us/pp/primarycare/index.html








Map Created February 2, 2010

Mental Health

Health Professional Shortage Areas (HPSAs)

Map Prepared By:

Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment GIS



Mental Health HPSA types

Facility Designation

Geographic

Not Designated


Data Current as of January 2010

For information on how to develop a Health Professional Shortage Area Application for your community, call 303-692-2470,

or visit the Primary Care Office website at the

Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment: www.cdphe.state.co.us/pp/primarycare

METRO DENVER



Source: Shortage Designation Branch, HRSA, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

20

80 Miles




MESA

SAN MIGUEL

DOLORES

MONTEZUMA

MONTROSE






Dental

Health Professional Shortage Areas (HPSAs)

Map Prepared By:


Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment GIS



Data Current as of January 2010

For information on how to develop a Health Professional Shortage Area Application for your community, call 303-692-2470, or visit the Primary Care Office website at the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment: www.cdphe.state.co.us/pp/primarycare

METRO DENVER



20

40

80 Miles




Primary Care

Health Professional Shortage Areas (HPSAs)

Map Prepared By:

Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment GIS




Primary Care HPSA types
Facility Designation
Geographic
Low-Income
Not Designated

Data Current as of January 2010

For information on how to develop a Health Professional Shortage Area Application for your community, call 303-692-2470, or visit the Primary Care Office website at the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment: www.cdphe.state.co.us/pp/primarycare

METRO DENVER



HCP CHIRP Data

<u>Overview</u>

This section contains data from the HCP CHIRP electronic database. The data reports activities between October 1, 2008 and September 30, 2009.

These data only reflect the population of CSHCN served by HCP local offices and are not directly comparable to other data sources, including state and national surveys. You may make such comparisons as long as you understand the limitations of doing so. National and state surveys use a randomly selected sample that is statistically representative of the CSHCN population as a whole for the geographic area included in the study. The data included here are from information entered by HCP local offices about the actual families and children in Colorado with whom they connected at any time during the specified period.

The purpose of this section is to present the data local HCP offices entered for activities from October 1, 2008 through September 30, 2009. You may use these data to:

- Describe the population with which each HCP region works
- Identify sub-populations who may need further outreach efforts
- Identify strengths and weaknesses related to the functions of each HCP region
- Establish baselines
- Help make informed decisions about future goals and objectives in the planning process
- Support and describe local office activities
- Monitor the population reached by HCP
- Assist in the quality improvement process
- Compare data with previous contract years

The first set of tables titled "Colorado" contains summarized data from all HCP regions in the state for the year ending September 30, 2009. These data describe HCP local office effort as a whole throughout the state. Following the statewide summaries, you will find data for each of the 14 HCP regions.

Level of Care Coordination is determined by a formula that considers the number of communications and whether or not the client has a Care Coordination Plan entered into CHIRP.

Explanation of Tables in Reports

 Number of HCP Clients by Level of Care Coordination & Number and Percent of Clients Having Primary Care Provider Documented – This table combines two tables that appeared in the data report published in 2009, HCP Clients Receiving Care Coordination by Level and HCP Clients Receiving Care Coordination with PCP by Level. The table provides a count of all clients by level of care coordination and the number of clients in those levels who have PCP information entered into CHIRP.

- Number of HCP Clients by Race and Level of Care Coordination

 This table shows how many different races and nationalities offices have captured for active clients in the database and the calculated level of care coordination for those clients. We have only included the categories with data reported.
- Number of Documented Types of Insurance and HCP Level of Care Coordination

 Clients can have several types of insurance active at the same time in CHIRP.
 This table is not a count of clients; it is a count of insurance types entered into CHIRP for active clients. A child can have an open category of no insurance at the same time as Medicaid, CHP+ or private insurance in the database. Each of those types is reported here. Insurance types HCP, Private Pay, Self Pay and No Insurance are included in the No Insurance lines.
- Number of HCP Clients by Age on October 1, 2008 and Level of Care Coordination – The 2009 HCP Client Age Statistics were modified to reflect age groupings according to the Recommendations for Preventive Pediatric Health Care, Bright Futures/American Academy of Pediatrics (2008). A multidisciplinary team of child health experts including providers, researchers, child health advocates, and parents developed the Bright Futures Health Supervision Guidelines. The Guidelines provide a framework for well-child care from birth to age 21. (Bright futures guidelines for health supervision of infants, children, and adolescents – Third Edition. (Edited by Joseph F. Hagan Jr. MD, FAAP; Judith S. Shaw, RN, MPH, EdD; and Paula Duncan, MD, FAAP; Elk Grove, Illinois: AAP Publications. 2008).
- HCP Top Referrals This table reports the most common referrals, up to 10 types, <u>to</u> other services or agencies made by the regions. Some regions do not record referral information.
- *HCP Top Services* The most common services, up to a maximum of ten, appear in this table.
- Number of HCP Clients by Ethnicity and Level of Care Coordination This table contains data reported for Hispanic or Non-Hispanic ethnicity.
- Number of HCP Clients by Gender and Level of Care Coordination— Where gender has been entered, this table captures the gender of clients by level.
- CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Type & Result This table shows
 the results of replies to CRCSN notifications by category and by whether or not
 the child is known or unknown to HCP at the time of the first CRCSN notification.
 (We receive multiple notifications for many children. The first notification is an
 "Unknown;" subsequent notifications come in as "Known" because the clients are
 already in the database.) This year we added a combined total for all CRCSN
 notification, both Known and Unknown, replies.

- Number and Type of CRCSN Notification Follow Up Communications —This table
 was added to help local offices more accurately assess the level of effort
 expended for providing care coordination services to CRCSN referred clients.
- Number of Community Encounters with Encounter Result and Duration in Hours –
 This table counts the total number and duration reported by group and result.
 Multi-county offices will also see a table showing the community encounters reported by county in their regions.
- Number of Outcome Types from Community Encounters This table summarizes
 the number of national outcomes addressed by local office community
 encounters.
- HCP Top Concerns This table reports the most common, up to a maximum of ten, concerns entered into the database for children receiving care coordination services.

Colorado Statewide HCP CHIRP Data October 1, 2008 - September 30, 2009

All Data Tables Record ONLY Clients Who Have Had At Least 1 Communication Entered In CHIRP Between October 2008 and September 2009

Number of HCP Clients by Level of Care Coordination and Number and Percent of Clients Having Primary Care Provider Documented							
Program Level Number of Clients With PC							
Level I	3,090	357	12%				
Level III	5,658	1,941	34%				
Level III	161	115	71%				
Total	8,909	2,413	27%				

Number of HCP Clients by Race and Level of Care Coordination							
	Level I	Level II	Level III	Total All Levels			
Afro-American/Black	5	21	5	31			
American Indian/Alaskan	7	23	1	31			
Asian	12	17	1	30			
Austrailian - Caucasian	3	2		5			
Black	3	5		8			
Caucasian/White	524	1,485	93	2,102			
Chinese	1	1	1	3			
Ethiopian	1	2		3			
Filipino	2	1		3			
Hawaiian	1	1		2			
Hispanic	32	64	18	114			
Indian	2	4	1	7			
Native American	7	4	2	13			
Not Specified	351	114	6	471			
Other	10	159	1	170			
Pacific Islander	1			1			
Saudi Arabian	1			1			
Unknown	6	4		10			
Vietnamese		1	1	2			
Total	969	1,908	130	3,007			

Number of Documented Types of Insurance and HCP Client Level of Care Coordination							
	Level I	Level II	Level III	Total All Levels			
CHP+	41	181	13	235			
HCP	32	346	4	382			
Insurance Other	31	220	6	257			
Medicaid	367	1,309	78	1,754			
Medicaid-Emergency	1	6	İ	7			
Medicaid-Sub. Adopt.	1	4	ļ	5			
Medicaid-TANF	15	115	5	135			
Medicaid-Waiver	3	14	1	17			
No Insurance	54	531	13	598			
Private Insurance	243	833	66	1,142			
Private Pay	11	65	1	77			
SSI - Medicaid	41	280	8	329			
Total	840	3,904	194	4,938			

Note: Clients can have several types of insurance active at the same time in CHIRP. This table is <u>not</u> a count of clients; it is a count of insurance types entered into CHIRP for active clients. A child can have an open category of *No Insurance* at the same time as *Medicaid, CHP+* or private insurance in the database. Each of those types is reported here. Insurance types *HCP, Private Pay, Self Pay* and *No Insurance* are included in the *No Insurance* lines.

Statewide HCP CHIRP Data October 2008 - September 2009

Number of HCP Clients by Age on October 1, 2008 and Level of Care Coordination									
Number of Clients	Number of Clients 0 to 12 Months 13 to 36 Months 3 to 5 Years 6 to 12 Years 13 to 17 Years 18 to 21 Years Total								
Level I	Level I 3,886 1,265 173 193 87 65 5,669								
Level II	642	568	333	877	423	230	3,073		
Level III	evel III 44 26 5 26 24 42 167								
Total All Levels	4,572	1,859	511	1,096	534	337	8,909		

HCP Top 10 Referrals						
Referral Type	Number					
Community Financial	175					
Community Family Support	173					
Community Education	70					
Community Health/Insurance	56					
Community Health/Public Systems	51					
Early Intervention	36					
HCP Staff	22					
Physical Therapist	7					
Community Center Board	5					
Community Providers	5					
Total	600					

HCP Top 10 Services						
Service Type	Number					
Clinic Neurology, HCP	316					
Care Coordination Services	150					
Nutrition and Diet Consultation	132					
Education Materials	78					
Clinic Rehab, HCP	78					
Nursing Assessment and Consultatio	73					
Family Info Binder	59					
Health Systems Navigation	52					
Clinic Genetic - HCP	49					
Parent to Parent Support	45					
Total	1,032					

Number of HCP Clients by Ethnicity and Level of Care Coordination							
Level II Level III Total A							
Hispanic	339	888	49	1,276			
Non Hispanic	283	1,001	68	1,352			
Unknown	339	58	8	405			
Total	961	1,947	125	3,033			

Number of HCP Clients by Gender and Level of Care Coordination								
Level I Level III Level III Total All Level								
Female	2329	1236	57	3,622				
Male	3180	1667	107	4,954				
Total	5,509	2,903	164	8,576				

HCP Top 10 Concerns						
Concern	Total Concerns					
Health Medical Needs (Child)	1082					
Support Systems	350					
Nutrition/Feeding	344					
Motor	339					
Insurance	325					
Education	324					
Speech-language	291					
Financial	268					
Other	252					
Clinic	242					
Total	3,817					

Statewide HCP CHIRP Data October 2008 - September 2009

				nmunication Res	<u>ult</u>		1
	Child	Known to HCP a	t time of CRC	SN Notification			
Result	Correspondence	Consultation	Phone	One-On-One	No Communication	Total Known	
Already in Non-HCP Services	4	47	23	5	89	168	
Child out of Home		2	3	1	3	9	
Diagnosis Low Priority	1				68	69	
Family has No concerns	1	10	43	4	41	99	
HCP Level I	2	3	21	7	18	51	
HCP Level II/III	6	6	23	23	105	163	
Lost to Follow-up	14	1	22		14	51	
Moved out of State					3	3	
No Capacity	1				42	43	
No Response from Family	52	3	29		161	245	
Terminally III/Deceased		1	2		3	6	
Total	81	73	166	40	547	907	
	Child N	ot Known to HCP	at time of CF	RCSN Notification			Total Replies for Known
Result	Correspondence	Consultation	Phone	One-On-One	No Communication	Total Unknown	and Unknown CRCSN Notifications Received
Already in Non-HCP Services	3	29	120	7	78	237	405
Child out of Home		3	7		10	20	29
Diagnosis Low Priority	19	11	4		821	855	924
Family has No concerns	13	2	359	5	26	405	504
HCP Level I	18	2	57	4	2	83	134
HCP Level II/III	34		33	15	9	91	254
Lost to Follow-up	51		95	1	58	205	256
Moved out of State			10		7	17	20
No Capacity	9		1		381	391	434
No Response from Family	467	2	190	1	472	1132	1377
Terminally III/Deceased	1		4		4	9	15
i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e		1		i .	i e		

This table shows the number of replies entered for CRCSN notifications sent to the Regional Office. It does not include CRCSN notification follow up communications.

Number and Type of CRCSN Notification Follow Up Communications by County							
	Total Notification						
					Follow Up		
System Generated Letters	Correspondence	Email	One-on-One	Phone Calls	Communications		
2107	317	25	6	584	3039		
Total	317	25	6	584	3039		

This table does not include replies reported in CRCSN Notification Replies by Result tables

Statewide HCP CHIRP Data October 2008 - September 2009

		1 .	Total Duration
Group	Result	Total Encounters	(Hours)
	Collaboration Transpired	156	270
	Community Training	11	18
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	20	151
Community Health Provider	Increased Awareness	83 102	99 190
	Increased Knowledge		
	Initiated Networking	60	65
	Procedures/Policies Established/Developed/Rev Staff Development	11 16	17 32
	Collaboration Transpired	116	257
	Community Training	5	18
	Grant Writing	1	1
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	4	14
Developmental	Increased Awareness	24	45
Disability Agency	Increased Knowledge	55	127
	Initiated Networking	13	15
	Procedures/Policies □Established/Developed/Rev	8	16
	Staff Development	5	40
	Collaboration Transpired	97	172
	Community Training	10	23
	Grant Writing	3	5
Education Partners	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	11	32
Education Partners	Increased Awareness	28	64
	Increased Knowledge	65	163
	Initiated Networking	24	34
	Staff Development	11	31
	Collaboration Transpired	1	1
Faith Based Partner	Increased Knowledge	1	0
	Initiated Networking	4	4
Family Network	Collaboration Transpired	85	209
	Community Training	34	131
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	1	1
	Increased Awareness	14	62
dining receivers	Increased Knowledge	12	17
	Initiated Networking	29	88
	Procedures/Policies Established/Developed/Rev	2	6
	Staff Development	2	6
	Collaboration Transpired	157	389
	Community Training	10	37
	Grant Writing	1 9	1 74
ICD Designal Team	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	116	203
HCP Regional Team	Increased Awareness Increased Knowledge	101	203
	Initiated Networking	21	32
	Procedures/Policies □Established/Developed/Rev	34	81
	Staff Development	40	182
	Collaboration Transpired	281	499
	Community Training	40	162
	Grant Writing	27	82
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	48	102
Other Community Partners	Increased Awareness	107	257
	Increased Knowledge	135	516
	Initiated Networking	110	210
	Procedures/Policies □Established/Developed/Rev	16	37
	Staff Development	26	100
	Collaboration Transpired	6	12
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	3	8
Oublic Officials	Increased Awareness	3	6
Public Officials	Increased Knowledge	6	31
	Initiated Networking	1	3
	Procedures/Policies □Established/Developed/Rev	5	8
Third Party Payers	Collaboration Transpired	1	1
		2428	5739

Number of Outcome Types from Community Encounters			
Outcome Type	Total		
Family Participation	631		
Medical Home	469		
Insurance	182		
Screening	294		
Community Care	1535		
Transition	214		
Regional Operations	720		
Total	4045		

Boulder Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data

October 2008 - September 2009

All Data Tables Record ONLY Clients Who Have Had At Least 1 Communication Entered in CHIRP Between October 2008 and September 2009

Number of HCP Clients by Level of Care Coordination & Number and Percent of Clients Having Primary Care Provider Documented									
	Boulder	# with PCP	% with PCP	Imagine!	# with PCP	% with PCP	Total	# with PCP	% with PCP
Level I	121	26	21%	13	1	8%	134	27	20%
Level II	262	162	62%	2	1	50%	264	163	62%
Level III	67	50	75%	2	1	50%	69	51	74%
Total	450	238	53%	17	3	18%	467	241	52%

Number of IICD Clients by Doos				
Number of HCP Clients by Race and Level of Care Coordination				
Level I	Doulder	iiiagiiie:	iotai	
Afro-American/Black		1	1	
American Indian/Alaskan	1	'	1	
Asian	1		1	
Black	1		1	
Caucasian/White	99	8	107	
Filipino	1	Ů	1	
H (Hispanic)	3		3	
Hispanic	10		10	
Indian	2		2	
Other	1		1	
Unknown		1	1	
Total Level I	119	10	129	
Level II				
A (Asian)	1		1	
American Indian/Alaskan	1		1	
Asian	1		1	
Caucasian/White	227	2	229	
Chinese	1		1	
Ethiopian	1		1	
H (Hispanic)	4		4	
Hispanic	20		20	
Indian	3		3	
Total Level II	259	2	261	
Level III				
A (Asian)	1		1	
Caucasian/White	50	1	51	
Chinese	1		1	
H (Hispanic)	3		3	
Hispanic	12		12	
Indian	1		1	
Other	1		1	
Total Level III	69	1	70	
Total All Levels	447	13	460	

Number of Documented Types of Insurance						
	and					
HCP Client	Level of Care Co	ordination				
Level of Care Coordination	Boulder	Imagine!	Total			
Level I						
CHP+	4		4			
Medicaid	44	3	47			
No Insurance	3	1	4			
Private Insurance	15		15			
Total Level I	66	4	70			
Level II						
CHP+	7		7			
Medicaid	87		87			
No Insurance			0			
Private Insurance	136	1	137			
Total Level II	230	1	231			
Level III						
CHP+	4		4			
Medicaid	38	2	40			
No Insurance			0			
Private Insurance	26	1	27			
Total Level III	68	3	71			
Total All Levels	364	8	372			

Total Number of Documented Types of Insurance and Client Level of Care Coordination				
CHP+	15	0	15	
Medicaid	169	5	174	
No Insurance	3	1	4	
Private Insurance 177 2 179				
Total By Insurance Type 364 8 372				

Note: Clients can have several types of insurance active at the same time in CHIRP. This table is <u>not</u> a count of clients; it is a count of insurance types entered into CHIRP for active clients. A child can have an open category of no insurance at the same time as Medicaid, CHP- or private insurance in the database. Each of those types is reported here. Insurance types HCP, Private Pay, Self Pay and No Insurance are included in the No Insurance lines.

Number of HCP Clients by Age on October 1, 2008				
and				
Le	evel of Care Coordin	nation		
	Boulder	Imagine!	Total	
Level I		Ü		
0-12 months	75		75	
13 to 36 months	45		45	
3 to 5 years	1		1	
6 to 12 years		1	1	
13 to 17 years		7	7	
18 to 21 years		5	5	
Total Level I	121	13	134	
Level II				
0-12 months	160		160	
13 to 36 months	88		88	
3 to 5 years	11		11	
6 to 12 years	1		1	
13 to 17 years			0	
18 to 21 years		2	2	
Total Level II	260	2	262	
Levell III				
0-12 months	43		43	
13 to 36 months	24		24	
3 to 5 years	2		2	
6 to 12 years			0	
13 to 17 years		1	1	
18 to 21 years		1	1	
Total Level III	69	2	71	
Total All Levels	450	17	467	

Number of HCP Clients by Gender and Level of Care Coordination				
	Boulder	Imagine!	Total	
Level I				
Female	42	8	50	
Male	77	5	82	
Total Level I	119	13	132	
Level II				
Female	110	1	111	
Male	146	1	147	
Total Level II	256	2	258	
Level III				
Female	27	1	28	
Male	39	1	40	
Total Level III	66	2	68	
Total All Levels	441	17	458	

HCP Clients by Ethnicity and Level of Care Coordination			
	Boulder	Imagine!	Total
Level I			
Hispanic	15		15
Mexican	15		15
Non Hispanic	88	9	97
Unknown	2		2
Total Level I	120	9	129
Level II			
Chinese	1		1
Hispanic	37		37
Mexican	17		17
Non Hispanic	199	2	201
Total Level II	254	2	256
Level III			
Hispanic	15		15
Mexican	14		14
Non Hispanic	40	1	41
Total Level III	69	1	70
Total All Levels	443	12	455

Boulder Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data, 2008-2009

HCP Top 10 Services		
Service Type	Number	
Education Materials	7	
Visual Impairment Treatment	5	
Cognitive Therapy	4	
Tutoring	3	
Acupuncture	1	
Assistive Devices and Technology	1	
Biofeedback	1	
Modifications	1	
Massage	1	
Neuromedical Treatment	1	
Total	25	

Number of Outcome Types from Community Encounters		
Outcome Type	Total	
Family Participation	4	
Medical Home	18	
Insurance	1	
Screening	11	
Community Care	197	
Transition	5	
Regional Operations	80	
Total	316	

HCP Top 10 Concerns		
Concerns	Total	
Health Medical Needs (Child)	221	
Cognitive	47	
Motor	46	
Personal-social	45	
Speech-language	44	
Vision	9	
Hearing	6	
Education	4	
Support Systems	4	
Financial	3	
Total	429	

HCP Top Referrals				
Referral Type	Number			
Early Intervention	5			
Community Health/Insurance	3			
Total	8			

	Number of Community Encounters with Encounter	Result and Duration in Hours	
			Total Duration
Group	Result	Total Encounters	(Hours)
	Collaboration Transpired	14	8
	Increased Awareness	25	9
Community Hoolth Broyider	Increased Knowledge	44	24
Community Health Provider	Initiated Networking	31	20
	Procedures/Policies Established/Developed/Rev	2	2
	Staff Development	1	3
David and the District Wife Among	Collaboration Transpired	1	1
Developmental Disability Agen	Procedures/Policies Established/Developed/Rev	1	2
	Collaboration Transpired	6	5
	Community Training	1	1
Education Partners	Increased Awareness	5	2
	Increased Knowledge	7	2
	Initiated Networking	9	4
Family Network	Collaboration Transpired	2	1
	Collaboration Transpired	16	13
	Community Training	2	7
UCD Degional Team	Increased Awareness	42	13
HCP Regional Team	Increased Knowledge	46	31
	Initiated Networking	8	3
	Procedures/Policies Established/Developed/Rev	5	6
	Collaboration Transpired	10	10
	Community Training	2	10
	Grant Writing	1	1
Other Community Partners	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	1	2
	Increased Awareness	2	1
	Initiated Networking	2	2
	Procedures/Policies Established/Developed/Rev	1	2
	Staff Development	1	5
Public Officials	Increased Knowledge	1	1
rubiic Officials	Procedures/Policies Established/Developed/Rev	1	3
Total		290	189

Boulder Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data, 2008-2009

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result

	Child Known to HCP at time of CRCSN Notification								
Туре	Already in Non- HCP Services	Diagnosis Low Priority	Family has No concerns	HCP Level I	HCP Level II/III	Lost to Follow-up	Moved Out of State	No Response from Family	Total
No Communications	20		8		18		1		47
Correspondence	1				4	1			6
Consultation									0
One-On-One			1						1
Phone	1		2	2	3				8
Total	22	0	11	2	25	1	1	0	62

	Child Not Known to HCP at time of CRCSN Notification								
Туре	Already in Non- HCP Services	Diagnosis Low Priority	Family has No concerns	HCP Level I	HCP Level II/III	Lost to Follow-up	Moved Out of State	No Response from Family	Total
No Communications	12	44			2				58
Correspondence					30	1			31
Consultation	3								3
One-On-One									0
Phone	3		5		2	3		3	16
Total	18	44	5	0	34	4	0	3	108

	All CRCSN Replies - Known and Unknown Children								
Туре	Already in Non- HCP Services	Diagnosis Low Priority	Family has No concerns	HCP Level I	HCP Level II/III	Lost to Follow-up	Moved Out of State	No Response from Family	Total
No Communications	32	44	8	0	20	0	1	0	105
Correspondence	1	0	0	0	34	2	0	0	37
Consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
One-On-One	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Phone	4	0	7	2	5	3	0	3	24
Total All CRCSN	40	44	16	2	59	5	1	3	170

This table shows the number of replies entered for CRCSN notifications sent to the Regional Office. It does not include Notification Follow Up communications.

	Number and Type of CRCSN Notification Follow Up Communications by County					
						Total Notification
	System Generated					Follow Up
County	Letters	Correspondence	Email	One-on-One	Phone Calls	Communications
Boulder	3	70			13	86
Total	3	70	0	0	13	86

This table does not include replies reported in CRCSN Notification Replies by Result tables

Denver Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data October 2008 - September 2009

All Data Tables Record ONLY Clients Who Have Had At Least 1 Communication Entered in CHIRP Between October 2008 and September 2009

Number of HCP Clients by Level of Care Coordination and Number and Percent of Clients Having Primary Care Provider Documented							
	Total # with PCP % with PCP						
Level I	1,008	4	0%				
Level II	evel II 189 146 77%						
evel III 17 17 100%							
Total	1,214	167	14%				

HCP Clients by Race and Level of Care			
Coordination	n Total		
Level I	TOTAL		
A (Asian)	1		
Afro-American/Black	1		
Asian	2		
Caucasian/White	196		
Hispanic	1 1		
Native American	4		
Not Specified	334		
Saudi Arabian	1		
Unknown	2		
Total Level I	542		
Level II	342		
A (Asian)	1		
Afro-American/Black	5		
American Indian/Alaskan	2		
Caucasian/White	119		
Hispanic	3		
Not Specified	46		
rtot oposinos			
O (Other)	1		
Other	7		
Vietnamese	1		
Total Level II	185		
Level III			
Afro-American/Black	4		
Caucasian/White	12		
Not Specified	1		
Vietnamese	1		
White	1		
Total Level III	19		
Total All Levels	746		

Number of Documented Types of Insurance and HCP Client Level of Care Coordination				
Level I				
CHP+	2			
Medicaid	13			
No Insurance	2			
Private Insurance	4			
Total Level I	21			
Level II				
CHP+	8			
Medicaid	151			
No Insurance	70			
Private Insurance	34			
Total Level II	263			
Level III				
CHP+	3			
Medicaid	12			
No Insurance	6			
Private Insurance	6			
Total Level III 27				
Total All Levels	311			

Total Number of Document Insurance and Level of Care Coordination fo	
CHP+	13
Medicaid	176
No Insurance	78
Private Insurance	44
Total By Insurance Type	311

Note: Clients can have several types of insurance active at the same time in CHIRP. This table is not a count of clients; it is a count of insurance types entered into CHIRP for active clients. A child can have an open category of no insurance at the same time as Medicaid, CHP+ or private insurance in the database. Each of those types is reported here, Insurance types HCP, Private Pay, Self Pay and No Insurance are included in the No Insurance lines.

Number of HCP Clients by Age on October 1, 2008 and Level of Care Coordination				
Level I				
0-12 months	819			
13 to 36 months	170			
3 to 5 years	11			
6 to 12 years	5			
13 to 17 years	1			
18 to 21 years	1			
Total Level I	1,007			
Level II				
0-12 months	29			
13 to 36 months	39			
3 to 5 years	22			
6 to 12 years	50			
13 to 17 years	26			
18 to 21 years	22			
Total Level II	188			
Levell III				
0-12 months				
13 to 36 months				
3 to 5 years	2			
6 to 12 years	6			
13 to 17 years	6			
18 to 21 years	5			
Total Level III	19			
Total All Levels	1,214			

Number of HCP Clients by Gender and Level of Care Coordination		
Level I		
Female	441	
Male	566	
Total Level I	1,007	
Level II		
Female	84	
Male	104	
Total Level II	188	
Level III		
Female	2	
Male	17	
Total Level III	19	
Total All Levels	1,214	

Number of HCP Clients by Ethnicity and Level of Care Coordination			
Level I			
Chinese	2		
Hispanic	136		
Mexican	65		
Non Hispanic	22		
Unknown	324		
Total Level I	549		
Level II			
Hispanic	88		
Mexican	54		
Non Hispanic	9		
Unknown	36		
Total Level II	187		
Level III			
Hispanic	5		
Mexican	5		
Non Hispanic	3		
Unknown	6		
Total Level III	19		
Total All Levels	755		

Denver Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data, 2008-2009

HCP Top 10 Services				
Service Type	Number			
Care Coordination Services	82			
Family Info Binder	58			
Education Materials	31			
Health Systems Navigation	31			
Assistive Devices and Technology	17			
Basic Needs Systems Navigation	17			
Funding Resources	17			
Health Problem Solving	15			
Health Insurance Assistance	13			
Basic Needs Family/Cleint Education	12			
Total	293			

HCP Top 10 Referrals			
Referral Type	Number		
Community Providers	5		
Community Center Board	3		
Community Education	2		
Community Family Support	2		
Service Provider Org	2		
Child Find	1		
Community Financial	1		
Community Health/Insurance	1		
Durable Medical Equip	1		
Hospital	1		
Total	19		

Group	Result	Total Encounters	Total Duration
	Collaboration Transpired	12	18
	Community Training	1	1
Community Health	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	5	4
Provider	Increased Awareness	2	2
	Increased Knowledge	4	9
	Initiated Networking	1	1
Name 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1	Collaboration Transpired	2	1
Developmental Disability Agency	Increased Awareness	2	1
olsability Agency	Increased Knowledge	2	1
Education Partners	Collaboration Transpired	5	4
	Community Training	2	1
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	2	2
	Increased Awareness	2	4
	Increased Knowledge	14	36
	Initiated Networking	1	4
	Staff Development	4	12
	Collaboration Transpired	1	1
amily Network	Increased Knowledge	2	3
	Staff Development	1	2
	Collaboration Transpired	48	114
ICP Regional Team	Increased Knowledge	2	10
	Staff Development	4	15
	Collaboration Transpired	65	97
	Community Training	2	3
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	5	4
Other Community Partners	Increased Awareness	6	4
	Increased Knowledge	11	9
	Initiated Networking	4	6
	Procedures/Policies established/developed/revised	1	2
	Staff Development	18	51
Public Officials	Collaboration Transpired	1	1
Total	·	232	416

Number of Outcome Types from Community Encounters				
Outcome Type	Total			
Family Participation	18			
Medical Home	15			
Insurance	7			
Screening	12			
Community Care	148			
Transition	20			
Regional Operations	104			
Total	324			

Top Ten Concerns				
Concerns	Total			
Health Medical Needs (Child)	161			
Insurance	105			
Support Systems	93			
Financial	83			
Education	81			
Health Medical Needs (Family)	71			
Speech-language	45			
Motor	42			
Primary Care Needs/Medical Home	38			
Housing	34			
Total	753			

Denver Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data, 2008-2009

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result

	CRUSN	Notification Replies	by Communicatio	n kesuit		1		
Communication Result	No Communications	Correspondence	Consultation	One-On-One	Phone	Total Client CRCSN Replies		
Child Known to HCP at time of CRCSN Notification								
Already in Non-HCP Services					1	1		
Child out of Home						0		
Diagnosis Low Priority						0		
Family has No concerns	11				9	20		
HCP Level I	1					1		
HCP Level II/III		1			1	2		
Lost to Follow-up	5				4	9		
Moved out of State						0		
No Capacity	31					31		
No Response from Family	50				8	58		
Terminally III/Deceased	2				1	3		
Total Known	100	1	0	0	24	125		
Child Not Known to HCP at time	of CRCSN Notification	on						
Already in Non-HCP Services					2	2		
Child out of Home					2	2		
Diagnosis Low Priority	185	1				186		
Family has No concerns	15				56	71		
HCP Level I	1			1	1	3		
HCP Level II/III					6	6		
Lost to Follow-up	2	1			24	27		
Moved out of State	1	3				4		
No Capacity	252					252		
No Response from Family	239	1		1	35	276		
Terminally III/Deceased		3			1	4		
Total Unknown	695	9	0	2	127	833		
All Replies to CRCSN Notification	ons - Known and Unk	nown Clients						
Already in Non-HCP Services	0	0	0	0	3	3		
Child out of Home	0	0	0	0	2	2		
Diagnosis Low Priority	185	1	0	0	0	186		
Family has No concerns	26	0	0	0	65	91		
HCP Level I	2	0	0	1	1	4		
HCP Level II/III	0	1	0	0	7	8		
Lost to Follow-up	7	1	0	0	28	36		
Moved out of State	1	3	0	0	0	4		
No Capacity	283	0	0	0	0	283		
No Response from Family	289	1	0	1	43	334		
Terminally III/Deceased	2	3	0	0	2	7		
Total CRCSN Communications	795	10	0	2	151	958		
This table shows the number of replies								

This table shows the number of replies entered for CRCSN notifications sent to the Regional Office. It does not include Notification Follow Up communications.

Number and Type of CRCSN Notification Follow Up Communications by County							
County	System Generated Letters	Correspondence	Email	One-on-One	Phone Calls	Total Notification Follow Up Communications	
Denver	316				5	321	
Total	316	0	0	0	5	321	

This table does not include replies reported in CRCSN Notification Replies by Result tables

El Paso Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data

October 2008 - September 2009

All Data Tables Record ONLY Clients Who Have Had At Least 1 Communication Entered in CHIRP Between October 2008 and September 2009

Number of HCP Clients by Level of Care Coordination and									
	El Paso	# with PCP	% with PCP	Teller	# with PCP	% with PCP	Total	# with PCP	% with PCP
Level I	673	14	2%	18		0%	691	14	2%
Level II	223	75	34%	5	2	40%	228	77	34%
Level III	7		0%			0%	7		0%
Total	903	89	10%	23	2	9%	926	91	10%

Number of HCP Clients by Race and Level of Care Coordination								
Level I El Paso Teller Total								
Afro-American/Black	1		1					
Austrailian - Caucasian	1		1					
Caucasian/White	8		8					
Ethiopian	1		1					
Total Level I	11	0	11					
Level II	Level II							
Afro-American/Black	1		1					
American Indian/Alaskan	2		2					
Asian	1		1					
Caucasian/White	71	2	73					
H (Hispanic)	2		2					
Other	2		2					
Total Level II	79	2	81					
Level III								
Caucasian	2		2					
Total Level III	2	0	2					
Total All Levels	92	2	94					

Number of Documented Types of Insurance							
and							
HCP Client Level of Care Coordination							
El Paso Teller Total							
Level I							
CHP+	3		3				
Medicaid	17		17				
No Insurance			0				
Private Insurance	3		3				
Total Level I	23	0	23				
Level II							
CHP+	6		6				
Medicaid	140	5	145				
No Insurance	48		48				
Private Insurance	22	1	23				
Total Level II	216	6	222				
Level III							
CHP+			0				
Medicaid	3		3				
No Insurance	1		1				
Private Insurance	4		4				
Total Level III	8	0	8				
Total All Levels	247	6	253				

Total Number of Documented Types of Insurance						
CHP+	9	0	9			
Medicaid	160	5	165			
No Insurance	49	0	49			
Private Insurance	29	1	30			
Total By Insurance Type	247	6	253			

Note: Clients can have several types of insurance active at the same time in CHIRP. This table is <u>not</u> a count of clients; it is a count of insurance types entered into CHIRP for active clients. A child can have an open category of no insurance at the same time as Medicaid, CHP+ or private insurance in the database. Each of those types is reported here. Insurance types *HCP*, *Private Pay*, *Self Pay* and *No Insurance* are included in the *No Insurance*

Number of HCP Clients by Age										
on October 1, 2008 and										
Level of Care Coordination										
Level I	El Paso	Teller	Total							
0-12 months	457	14	471							
13 to 36 months	172	3	175							
3 to 5 years	16	1	17							
6 to 12 years	18		18							
13 to 17 years	1		1							
18 to 21 years	1		1							
Total Level I	665	18	683							
Level II										
0-12 months	44	2	46							
13 to 36 months	61	1	62							
3 to 5 years	25		25							
6 to 12 years	66	1	67							
13 to 17 years	22		22							
18 to 21 years	13	1	14							
Total Level II	231	5	236							
Levell III										
0-12 months										
13 to 36 months										
3 to 5 years										
6 to 12 years	2		2							
13 to 17 years	1		1							
	4		4							
18 to 21 years Total Level III	7	_	7 7							
		0								
Total All Levels	903	23	926							

Number of HCP Clients by Gender and										
Level I	El Paso	Teller	Total							
Female	281	8	289							
Male	379	10	389							
Total Level I	660	18	678							
Level II										
Female	93	2	95							
Male	135	3	138							
Total Level II	228	5	233							
Level III										
Female	3		3							
Male	4		4							
Total Level III	7	0	7							
Total All Levels	895	23	918							

HCP Clients by Ethnicity and Level of Care									
Level I	El Paso	Teller	Total						
Hispanic	4		4						
Mexican	4		4						
Non Hispanic	4		4						
Total Level I	12	0	12						
Level II									
Hispanic	36		36						
Mexican	15		15						
Non Hispanic	21	2	23						
Unknown	1		1						
Total Level II	73	2	75						
Level III									
Mexican	1		1						
Non Hispanic	1		1						
Total Level III	2	0	2						
Total All Levels	87	2	89						

El Paso Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data, 2008-2009

HCP Top Services							
Service Type	Number						
Nursing Assessment and Consultation	52						
Nutrition and Diet Consultation	22						
Psychological & Mental Health Services	7						
Assistive Devices and Technology	3						
Massage	2						
Patient, Family and Support Systems Education	2						
Education Materials	1						
Home and Environmental Modifications	1						
School Problem Solving and Support	1						
Total	91						

HCP Top 10 Concerns							
Concern Type	Number						
Health Medical Needs (Child)	43						
Nutrition/Feeding	36						
Vision	21						
Education	18						
Hearing	15						
Support Systems	10						
Behavior/Emotional (Child)	9						
Health Medical Needs (Family)	9						
Insurance	9						
DME	8						
Total	178						

Number of Community Encounters with Encounter Result and Duration in Hours									
Group	Result	Total Encounters	Total Duration (Hours)						
Community Health Provider	Collaboration Transpired	2	4						
	Increased Awareness	1	2						
	Increased Knowledge	2	4						
	Initiated Networking	3	6						
Developmental Disability Agency	Collaboration Transpired	2	4						
	Community Training	1	2						
	Increased Knowledge	1	2						
Education Partners	Collaboration Transpired	4	7						
	Community Training	1	3						
	Increased Awareness	1	5						
	Increased Knowledge	10	26						
	Initiated Networking	3	4						
Faith Based Partner	Initiated Networking	1	2						
Family Network	Community Training	1	3						
HCP Regional Team	Collaboration Transpired	2	6						
	Improved Community Identification of	1	1						
	Increased Knowledge	4	10						
	Procedures/Policies established/dev	1	5						
	Staff Development	3	9						
Other Community Partners	Collaboration Transpired	12	22						
	Increased Awareness	3	7						
	Increased Knowledge	12	30						
	Initiated Networking	6	11						
Total		77	171						

Number of Outcome Types from Community Encounters							
Outcome Type	Total						
Family Participation	41						
Medical Home	16						
Insurance	19						
Screening	18						
Community Care	72						
Transition	22						
Regional Operations	5						
Total	193						

Community Encounters by County							
County	Total Encounters						
El Paso	77						
Teller	0						
Total	77						

El Paso Region reported no referrals.

El Paso Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data, 2008-2009

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result

	Child Known to HCP at time of CRCSN Notification												
Туре	Already in Non-HCP Services	Child out of Home	Diagnosis Low Priority	Family has No concerns	HCP Level I	HCP Level	Lost to Follow-up	Moved out of State	No Capacity	No Response from Family	Terminally III/Deceased	Total	
No Communications	4			8	2	29		1		58	2	104	
Correspondence												0	
Consultation												0	
One-On-One					3	2						5	
Phone	1			1	6		2					10	
Total Known	5			9	11	31	2	1	0	58	2	119	

	Child Not Known to HCP at time of CRCSN Notification												
Туре	Already in Non-HCP Services	Child out of Home	Diagnosis Low Priority	Family has No concerns	HCP Level I	HCP Level	Lost to Follow-up	Moved out of State	No Capacity	No Response from Family	Terminally III/Deceased	Total	
No Communications		6	64			1	4		24	5	1	105	
Correspondence				1					1	151		153	
Consultation												0	
One-On-One												0	
Phone	19	1		4	1	4	4	1	1			35	
Total Unknown	19			5	1	5	8	1	26	156	1	293	

	All CRCSN Communications												
Туре	Already in Non-HCP Services	Child out of Home	Diagnosis Low Priority	Family has	HCP Level I	HCP Level	Lost to Follow-up	Moved out of State	No Capacity	No Response from Family	Terminally III/Deceased	Total	
No Communications	4	6	64	8	2	30	4	1	24	63	3	209	
Correspondence	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	151	0	153	
Consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One-On-One	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Phone	20	1	0	5	7	4	6	1	1	0	0	45	
Total All CRCSN	24	7	64	14	12	36	10	2	26	214	3	412	

This table shows the number of replies entered for CRCSN notifications sent to the Regional Office. It does not include Notification

1

Number and Type of CRCSN Notification Follow Up Communications by County										
System Generated County Letters Correspondence Email One-on-One Phone Calls Communicat										
El Paso	1	128			121	250				
Teller		6				6				
Total	1	134	0	0	121	256				

This table does not include replies reported in CRCSN Notification Replies by Result tables

Jefferson Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data October 2008 - September 2009

All Data Tables Record ONLY Clients Who Have Had At Least 1 Communication Entered in CHIRP Between October 2008 and September 2009

	Number of HCP Clients by Level of Care Coordination & Number and Percent of Clients Having Primary Care Provider Documented											
County	Level I				Level II			Level III			otal All Level	s
	# of Clients	# with PCP	% with PCP	# of Clients	# with PCP	% with PCP	# of Clients	# with PCP	% with PCP	# of Clients	# with PCP	% with PCP
Broomfield	79	22	28%	35	30	86%	1	1	100%	115	53	46%
Clear Creek	12	5	42%	4	4	100%			0%	16	9	56%
Gilpin	6		0%	2	1	50%			0%	8	1	13%
Jefferson	592	40	7%	242	216	89%	17	17	100%	851	273	32%
Park	16	8	50%	9	9	100%			0%	25	17	68%
Total	705	75	11%	292	260	89%	18	18	100%	1,015	353	35%

	Number of HCP Clients by Race and Level of Care Coordination								
Program Level	Race	Broomfield	Clear Creek	Gilpin	Jefferson	Park	Total Level by Race		
Level I	A (Asian)				2		2		
Level I	Afro-American/Black				1		1		
Level I	American Indian/Alaskan	2				1	3		
Level I	Asian	2			2		4		
Level I	Black				1		1		
Level I	Caucasian/White	20	5	2	22	7	56		
Level I	Filipino				1		1		
Level I	H (Hispanic)				1		1		
Level I	Hawaiian				1		1		
Level I	Hispanic				1		1		
Level I	Not Specified				4		4		
Level I	O (Other)	1					1		
Level I	Pacific Islander					1	1		
Level I	UNK				1		1		
Level I	W (White)	3					3		
Level I Total	· · · · ·	28	5	2	37	9	81		
Level II	A (Asian)	2			1		3		
Level II	Afro-American/Black				7		7		
Level II	American Indian/Alaskan				3		3		
Level II	Asian	2			2		4		
Level II	Black			1	1		2		
Level II	Caucasian/White	22	4		137	6	169		
Level II	H (Hispanic)				3		3		
Level II	Hispanic				6		6		
Level II	Native American				1		1		
Level II	Not Specified				1		1		
Level II	O (Other)				2		2		
Level II	Other	3					3		
Level II	Unknown				1		1		
Level II	W (White)				1		1		
Level II	White				4		4		
Level II Total		29	4	1	170	6	210		
Level III	Caucasian/White				9		9		
Level III	H (Hispanic)		i		1		1		
Level III	Hispanic	1			1		1		
Level III	Native American		i		2		2		
Level III Total		1	0	0	12	0	13		
Grand Total	t	58	9	3	219	15	304		

Number of HCP Clients by Gender and Level of Care Coordination									
Program Level	Gender	Broomfield	Clear Creek	Gilpin	Jefferson	Park	Total Level by Gender		
Level I	Female	25	4	3	259	2	293		
Level I	Male	51	8	3	321	14	397		
Level I Total		76	12	6	580	16	690		
Level II	Female	16	1	1	105	2	125		
Level II	Male	17	3	1	133	7	161		
Level II Total		33	4	2	238	9	286		
Level III	Female				5		5		
Level III	Male	1			12		13		
Level III Total		1	0	0	17	0	18		
Grand Total		110	16	8	835	25	994		

Number of HCP Clients by Ethnicity and Level of Care Coordination									
Program Level	Ethnicity	Broomfield	Clear Creek	Gilpin	Jefferson	Park	Total Level by Ethnicity		
Level I	Hispanic	8			18		26		
Level I	Mexican				1		1		
Level I	Non Hispanic	16	5	1	25	9	56		
Level I	Unknown	2			2		4		
Level I Total		26	5	1	46	9	87		
Level II	Hispanic	4	1		61		66		
Level II	Non Hispanic	24	3	1	118	6	152		
Level II	Puerto Rican	1					1		
Level II	Unknown				1		1		
Level II Total		29	4	1	180	6	220		
Level III	Hispanic	1			3		4		
Level III	Non Hispanic				8		8		
Level III Total		1	0	0	11	0	12		
Grand Total		56	9	2	237	15	319		

Top Ten Services							
Service Type	Number						
Care Coordination Services	55						
Parent to Parent Support	30						
Nutrition and Diet Consultation	27						
Education Materials	8						
Primary Care	8						
Adaptive devices	5						
Assistive Devices and Technology	4						
Home and Environmental Modifications	4						
Neuromedical Treatment	4						
Speech & Language Therapy	4						
Total	149						

HCP Top Ten Referrals						
Referral Type	Number					
Community Family Support	58					
Community Education	11					
Early Intervention	9					
Community Health/Public Systems	5					
Community Financial	4					
Community Health/Insurance	2					
Dietitian	2					
Child Find	1					
Housing	1					
Nurse	1					
Total	94					

Number of HCP Clients by Age on October 1, 2008 and Level of Care Coordination									
	Broomfield	Clear Creek	Gilpin	Jefferson	Park	Total			
Level I									
0-12 months	28	5	4	360	4	401			
13 to 36 months	29	2	1	165	3	200			
3 to 5 years	7			46	3	56			
6 to 12 years	8	4	1	16	3	32			
13 to 17 years	2	1		1	3	7			
18 to 21 years	5			3		8			
Total Level I	79	12	6	591	16	704			
Level II									
0-12 months	4		2	55		61			
13 to 36 months	9	1		62	2	74			
3 to 5 years	6	1		38	1	46			
6 to 12 years	8	2		52	6	68			
13 to 17 years	3			20		23			
18 to 21 years	3			11		14			
Total Level II	33	4	2	238	9	286			
Levell III									
0-12 months				1		1			
13 to 36 months						0			
3 to 5 years						0			
6 to 12 years				3		3			
13 to 17 years			•	3		3			
18 to 21 years	1			10		11			
Total Level III	1	0	0	17	0	18			
Total All Levels	113	16	8	846	25	1008			

Number of Documented Types of Insurance and HCP Client Level of Care Coordination									
	Broomfield	Clear Creek	Gilpin	Jefferson	Park	Total			
Level I									
CHP+	2			1	1	4			
Medicaid	21	5		21	4	51			
No Insurance	8	1			5	14			
Private Insurance	23	1		13	4	41			
Total Level I	54	7	0	35	14	110			
Level II									
CHP+	1	1		9	1	12			
Medicaid	19	4		155	8	186			
No Insurance	5	1		19	1	26			
Private Insurance	23	1	1	113		138			
Total Level II	48	7	1	296	10	362			
Level III									
CHP+						0			
Medicaid				6		6			
No Insurance						0			
Private Insurance	1			13		14			
Total Level III	1	0	0	19	0	20			
All Levels	103	14	1	350	24	492			
CHP+	3	1	0	10	2	16			
Medicaid	40	9	0	182	12	243			
No Insurance	13	2	0	19	6	40			
Private Insurance	47	2	1	139	4	193			
Total All Levels	103	14	1	350	24	492			

Note: Clients can have several types of insurance active at the same time in CHIRP. This table is <u>not</u> a count of clients; it is a count of insurance types entered into CHIRP for active clients. A child can have an open category of no insurance at the same time as Medicaid, CHP+ or private insurance in the database. Each of those types is reported here. Insurance types HCP, Private Pay, Self Pay and No Insurance are included in the No Insurance lines.

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result

	Child Kr	nown to HCP at t	ime of CRCSN I				Result				
County	Already in Non-HCP Services	Child out of Home	Diagnosis Low Priority	Family has No concerns	HCP Level I	HCP Level	Lost to Follow- up	Moved out of State	No Capacity	No Response from Family	Total Known
Broomfield											
No Communication	1							1			2
Correspondence											0
Consultation											0
One-On-One						1					1
Phone				1	5						6
Total Broomfield	1	0	0	1	5	1	0	1	0	0	9
Jefferson											
No Communication	5		2	4	1	25	3		1	11	52
Correspondence							2			25	27
Consultation											0
One-On-One						2					2
Phone	2	1		9	1	7				4	24
Total Jefferson	7	1	2	13	2	34	5	0	1	40	105
Clear Creek											
No Communication											0
Correspondence											0
Consultation											0
One-On-One											0
Phone											0
Total Clear Creek	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Park											
No Communication											0
Correspondence											0
Consultation											0
One-On-One											0
Phone											0
Total Park	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jefferson Region Total Known											
No Communication	6	0	2	4	1	25	3	1	1	11	54
Correspondence	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	25	27
Consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One-On-One											
Phone	2	1	0	10	6	7	0	0	0	4	30
Jefferson County Total Known	8	1	2	14	7	32	5	1	1	40	111

This table shows the number of replies entered for CRCSN notifications sent to the Regional Office. It does not include Notification Follow Up communications.

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result

	CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result Child Unknown to HCP at time of CRCSN Notification by Communication Type & Result										
	_	Child Unkn	own to HCP a	t time of CRC	SN Notificati	on by Communica	tion Type	& Kesult			
County	Already in Non- HCP Services	Diagnosis Low Priority	Family has No concerns	HCP Level I	HCP Level	Lost to Follow- up	Moved out of State	No Capacity	No Response from Family	Terminally III/Deceased	Total Unknown
Broomfield											
No Communication											0
Correspondence											0
Consultation											0
One-On-One				1							1
Phone			13	4							17
Total Broomfield	0	0	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Jefferson											
No Communication	3	18	2		2	3	1	1	54		84
Correspondence	1		1		1	13			146	1	163
Consultation											0
One-On-One	1		1		6						8
Phone	4		41	4	1				12		62
Total Jefferson	9	18	45	4	10	16	1	1	212	1	317
Clear Creek											
No Communication		2									2
Correspondence			1						2		3
Consultation									_		0
One-On-One											0
Phone			1						2		3
Total Clear Creek	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	8
Park											
No Communication								1	1		2
Correspondence									5		5
Consultation									Ŭ		0
One-On-One											0
Phone											0
Total Park	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	7
Jefferson Region			-		_				-		
No Communication	3	20	2	0	2	3	1	2	55	0	88
Correspondence	1	0	2	0	1	13	0	0	153	1	171
Consultation	 	· ·		_ <u> </u>	<u> </u>	10			100		0
One-On-One	†										9
Phone	4	0	55	8	1	0	0	0	14	0	82
Jefferson Region Total	†	_		-	l .	-		-		-	
Unknown	8	20	59	8	4	16	1	2	222	1	350
		Sum	nmary - All Jeffe	rson Region,	Known and U	nknown Children CR	CSN Replie	s			
No Communication	9	20	6	1	27	6	2	3	66	54	88
Correspondence	1	0	2	0	1	15	0	0	178	28	171
Consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One-On-One	Ì										9
Phone	6	1	65	14	8	0	0	0	18	30	82
Total All CRCSN	1	· ·							· · ·		
Communications	16	21	73	15	36	21	2	3	262	112	350
This table shows the number of									1		

This table shows the number of replies entered for CRCSN notifications sent to the Regional Office. It does not include Notification Follow Up communication

Number and Type of CRCSN Notification Follow Up Communications by County									
County	System Generated Letters	Correspondence	Email	One-on-One	Phone Calls	Total Notification Follow Up Communications			
Broomfield					13	13			
Clear Creek						0			
Gilpin	2	1				3			
Jefferson	437	10		1	60	508			
Park	10				4	14			
Total	449	11	0	1	77	538			

This table does not include replies reported in CRCSN Notification Replies by Result tables

Number of Commun	Number of Community Encounters with Encounter Result and Duration in Hours						
Group	Result	Total Encounters	Total Duration (hours)				
Community Health Provider	Community Training	1	1				
	Increased Knowledge	2	10				
Developmental Disability Agency	Increased Knowledge	1	1				
Education Partners	Increased Knowledge	2	10				
	Staff Development	1	5				
Family Network	Initiated Networking	8	24				
HCP Regional Team	Collaboration Transpired	2	8				
	Community Training	4	16				
	Increased Awareness	2	2				
	Increased Knowledge	4	5				
	Staff Development	6	26				
Other Community Partners	Collaboration Transpired	25	24				
•	Community Training	1	2				
	Grant Writing	2	6				
	Improved Community Identification of	<u> </u>	<u> </u>				
	CYSHCN	1	5				
	Increased Awareness	6	12				
	Increased Knowledge	13	28				
	Initiated Networking	2	3				
	Staff Development	1	2				
	Procedures/Policies						
Public Officials	established/developed/revised	84	1				
Total		168	189				

Number of Outcome Types from Community Encounters		
Outcome Type	Total	
Family Participation	18	
Medical Home	13	
Insurance	6	
Screening	5	
Community Care	58	
Transition	1	
Regional Operations	11	
Total	112	

Community Encounters by County		
County	Total	
Broomfield County Health Dept	30	
Jefferson County Department Health and Environment	55	
Total	85	

Top Ten Concerns		
Concerns	Total	
Other	154	
Health Medical Needs (Child)	123	
Support Systems	100	
Nutrition/Feeding	92	
Child Abuse/Neglect	85	
Motor	81	
Speech-language	77	
Education	59	
Insurance	57	
Cognitive	48	
Total	876	

Larimer Regional Office **HCP CHIRP Data**

October 2008 - September 2009

All Data Tables Record ONLY Clients Who Have Had At Least 1 Communication Entered in CHIRP Between October 2008 and September 2009

Number of HCP Clients by Level of Care Coordination and Number and Percent of Clients Having Primary Care Provider Documented								
Total # with PCP % with I								
Level I	457	22	5%					
Level II	46	29	63%					
Level III	2 1 50%							
Total	505	52	10%					

HCP Clients by Race and			
Level of Care Coordination			
	Total		
Level I			
Austrailian - Caucasian	1		
Caucasian/White	6		
Chinese	1		
Hispanic	1		
Not Specified	1		
Total Level I	10		
Level II			
Caucasian/White	15		
H (Hispanic)	1		
Hispanic	1		
Not Specified	3		
Other	5		
Total Level II	25		
Level III			
Hispanic	1		
Total Level III	1		
All Levels			
Total All Levels	36		

Number of Types of Insurance Recorded by Client Level of Care Coordination		
Level I		
CHP+	4	
Medicaid	26	
No Insurance	1	
Private Insurance	14	
Total Level I	45	
Level II		
CHP+ Medicaid No Insurance Private Insurance Total Level II	1 36 9 9	
Level III		
CHP+	1	
Medicaid		
No Insurance		
Private Insurance		
Total Level III	1	
All Levels	101	
CHP+	6	
Medicaid	62	
No Insurance	10	
Private Insurance	23	
Total All Levels	101	

Note: Clients can have several types of insurance active at the same time in CHIRP. This table is <u>not</u> a count of clients; it is a count of insurance types entered into CHIRP for active clients. A child can have an open category of no insurance at the same time as Medicaid, CHP+ or private insurance in the database. Each of those types is reported here. Insurance types HCP, Private Pay, Self Pay and No Insurance are included in the No Insurance lines.

Number of HCP Clients by Age on			
October 1, 2008 and			
Level I			
0-12 months	299		
13 to 36 months	101		
3 to 5 years	14		
6 to 12 years	28		
13 to 17 years	11		
18 to 21 years	4		
Total Level I	457		
Level II			
0-12 months	3		
13 to 36 months	4		
3 to 5 years	9		
6 to 12 years	19		
13 to 17 years	8		
18 to 21 years	3		
Total Level II	46		
Levell III			
0-12 months			
13 to 36 months			
3 to 5 years			
6 to 12 years	2		
13 to 17 years			
18 to 21 years			
Total Level III 2			
Total All Levels	505		

Number of HCP Clients by Gender and Level of Care Coordination			
Level I			
Female	177		
Male	244		
Total Level I	421		
Level II			
Female	17		
Male	26		
Total Level II	43		
Level III			
Female	2		
Male			
Total Level III	2		
Total All Levels	466		

HCP Clients by Ethnicity and Level of Care Coordination		
Level I		
Chinese	1	
Hispanic	2	
Non Hispanic	2	
Total Level I	5	
Level II		
Hispanic	0	
Non Hispanic	0	
Unknown	0	
Total Level II	0	
Level III		
Hispanic 15		
Non Hispanic 9		
Unknown		
Total Level III 24		
Total All Levels	29	

Larimer Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data, 2008-2009

HCP Top 10 Services		
Service Type	Number	
Care Coordination Services	3	
Activites of Daily Living	2	
Clinic Neurology, HCP	2	
Child Abuse and Neglect	1	
Developmental Screening	1	
Education Materials	1	
Food	1	
Nursing-Anticipatory Guidance	1	
Patient, Family and Support Systems Education	1	
Primary Care	1	
Total	14	

HCP Top 10 Referrals			
Referral Type	Number		
Community Health/Insurance	2		
Community Education	2		
Community Family Support	2		
Community Financial	1		
Durable Medical Equip	1		
Housing	1		
School	1		
Total	10		

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result

Communication Type	No Communications	Correspondence	Consultation	One-On- One	Phone	Total
Child Known to HCP at time of CRCSN Notification						
Already in Non-HCP Services	5				7	12
Child Out of Home						0
Diagnosis Low Priority	1					1
Family has No concerns	5			1	6	12
HCP Level I	2				1	3
HCP Level II/III	2			5	3	10
Lost to Follow-up	1					1
Moved Out of State						0
No Response from Family	1	2			6	9
Terminally III/ Deceased						0
Total Known	17	2	0	6	23	48
Child Not Known to HCP at Time of CRCS Already in Non-HCP Services	N Notification		1		23	26
Child Out of Home	1				20	1
Diagnosis Low Priority	5					5
Family has No concerns	3	3			39	45
HCP Level I	1	2		1	6	10
HCP Level II/III	1				3	4
Lost to Follow-up	3				1	4
Moved Out of State	1				2	3
No Response from Family	18	15	2		47	82
Terminally III/ Deceased	1					1
Total Unknown	36	20	3	1	121	181
All CRCSN, Known and Unknown to HCP	at Time of CRCSN Notificati	on				
Already in Non-HCP Services	7	0	1	0	30	38
Child Out of Home	1	0	0	0	0	1
Diagnosis Low Priority	6	0	0	0	0	6
Family has No concerns	8	3	0	1	45	57
HCP Level I	3	2	0	1	7	13
HCP Level II/III	3	0	0	5	6	14
Lost to Follow-up	4	0	0	0	1	5
Moved Out of State	1	0	0	0	2	3
No Response from Family	19	17	2	0	53	91
Terminally III/ Deceased	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total All CRCSN Communications	53	22	3	7	144	229

This table shows the number of replies entered for CRCSN notifications sent to the Regional Office. It does not include Notification Follow Up Communications.

Number and Type of CRCSN Notification Follow Up Communications by County									
System Generated County									
Larimer	221	8		3	82	314			
Total	221	8	0	3	82	314			

This table does not include replies reported in CRCSN Notification Replies by Result tables.

Larimer Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data, 2008-2009

Number of Community Encounters with Encounter Result and Duration in Hours						
			Total Duration			
Group	Result	Total Encounters	(hours)			
Community Health Provider	Collaboration Transpired	62	83			
	Increased Awareness	5	4			
	Increased Knowledge	13	26.5			
	Initiated Networking	1	0.75			
	Staff Development	1	4			
Developmental Disability Agency	Collaboration Transpired	41	118.25			
,	Improved Community Identification of					
	CYSHCN	1	2			
	Increased Awareness	1	1			
Education Partners	Collaboration Transpired	33	42.5			
		1	2			
	Increased Awareness	1	0.75			
	Initiated Networking	1	3			
	Staff Development	2	8			
Family Network	Collaboration Transpired	59	145			
•	Community Training	11	46.5			
	Increased Awareness	1	0.5			
	Increased Knowledge	1	0.5			
	Increased Knowledge 13 Initiated Networking 1 Staff Development 1 Collaboration Transpired 41 Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN 1 Increased Awareness 1 Collaboration Transpired 33 Community Training 1 Increased Awareness 1 Initiated Networking 1 Staff Development 2 Collaboration Transpired 59 Community Training 11 Increased Awareness 1 Initiated Networking 11 Increased Knowledge 1 Increased Knowledge 1 Increased Knowledge 7 Collaboration Transpired 55 Increased Knowledge 7 Collaboration Transpired 55 Increased Knowledge 7 Collaboration Transpired 55 Increased Knowledge 7 Collaboration Transpired 35 Community Training 4 Grant Writing 7 Increased Awareness 10 Increased Knowledge 6	32				
HCP Regional Team		5	13			
	Increased Knowledge	Total Encounters 62 5 13 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 59 11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	60.5			
Other Community Partners	Collaboration Transpired	35	62			
•		4	10.25			
	Grant Writing	7	10.75			
	Increased Awareness	10	29.75			
	Increased Knowledge	6	15.75			
	Initiated Networking	2	5.75			
Total		323	728			

Number of Outcome Types from Community Encounters					
Outcome Type	Total				
Family Participation	138				
Medical Home	131				
Insurance	14				
Screening	16				
Community Care	165				
Transition	47				
Regional Operations	18				
Total	529				

Top Ten Concerns					
Concerns	Total				
Health Medical Needs (Child)	40				
Education	32				
Financial	18				
Insurance	17				
Behavior/Emotional (Child)	16				
Motor	16				
Speech-language	13				
Support Systems	13				
Family Relationships	12				
Health Medical Needs (Family)	10				
Total	187				

Northeast Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data October 2008 - September 2009

All Data Tables Record ONLY Clients Who Have Had At Least 1 Communication Entered in CHIRP Between October 2008 and September 2009

Number of HCP Clients by Level of Care Coordination & Number and Percent of Clients Having Primary Care Provider							
		# with					
	Total PCP % with PCP						
Level I	72	7	10%				
Level II	195	164	84%				
Level III	6	5	83%				
Total	273	176	64%				

HCP Clients by Race and Level of Care Coordination					
	Total				
Level I					
American Indian/Alaskan	1				
Caucasian	5				
Total Level I	6				
Level II					
Black	2				
Caucasian	82				
Filipino	1				
Hispanic	7				
Other	8				
Total Level II	100				
Level III					
Caucasian	3				
Total Level III	3				
Total All Levels	109				

Number of Documented Types of Insurance and						
HCP Client Level of Care Coordination Level I						
CHP+	0					
Medicaid	7					
No Insurance	1					
Private Insurance	2					
Total Level I	10					
Level II						
CHP+	26					
Medicaid	134					
No Insurance	34					
Private Insurance	115					
Total Level II	309					
Level III						
CHP+	0					
Medicaid	5					
No Insurance	1					
Private Insurance	3					
Total Level III	9					
All Levels						
CHP+	26					
Medicaid	146					
No Insurance	36					
Private Insurance	120					
Total All Levels	328					

Note: Clients can have several types of insurance active at the same time in CHIRP. This table is <u>not</u> a count of clients; it is a count of insurance types entered into CHIRP for active clients. A child can have an open category of no insurance at the same time as Medicaid, CHP+ or private insurance in the database. Each of those types is reported here. Insurance types HCP, Private Pay, Self Pay and No Insurance are included in the No Insurance lines.

Number of HCP Clients by Age on October 1, 2008 & Level of Care Coordination					
Level I					
0-12 months	38				
13 to 36 months	22				
3 to 5 years	1				
6 to 12 years	7				
13 to 17 years	2				
18 to 21 years	1				
Total Level I	71				
Level II					
0-12 months	27				
13 to 36 months	21				
3 to 5 years	20				
6 to 12 years	77				
13 to 17 years	44				
18 to 21 years	7				
Total Level II	196				
Levell III					
0-12 months					
13 to 36 months					
3 to 5 years					
6 to 12 years	2				
13 to 17 years	2				
18 to 21 years	2				
Total Level III	6				
Total All Levels	273				

Number of HCP Clients by Gender & Level of Care Coordination				
Level I				
Female	33			
Male	37			
Unk	1			
Total Level I 71				
Level II				
Female	94			
Male	95			
Total Level II	189			
Level III				
Male	3			
Female	3			
Total Level III	6			
Total All Levels	266			

Number of HCP Clients by Ethnicity & Level of Care Coordination				
Level I				
Hispanic	1			
Non Hispanic	5			
Total Level I	6			
Level II				
Hispanic	37			
Non Hispanic	63			
Total Level II	100			
Level III				
Hispanic	1			
Non Hispanic	2			
Total Level III	3			
Total All Levels	109			

Northeast Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data, 2008-2009

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result

		<u>U</u>	ACSN NOUII	CallOff No	piles by C	Ommunication R	esuit			
Communication Type	Already in Non-HCP Services	Child out of Home	Diagnosis Low Priority	Family has No concerns	HCP Level	HCP Level II/III	Lost to Follow- up	Moved out of State	No Response from Family	Total
Child Known to HCP at ti	me of CRCSN	Notification								
No Communications							1		1	2
Correspondence										0
Consultation										0
One-On-One					1	1				2
Phone						3			1	4
Total Known	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	2	8
Child Not Known to HCP	at time of CRC	SN Notification								
No Communications							2	1	14	17
Correspondence						1				1
Consultation										0
One-On-One	1					1				2
Phone		1	1	6	2	8				18
Total Unknown	1	1	1	6	2	10	2	1	14	38
Total CRCSN - Region - I	Known and Un	known Combined								
No Communications	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	15	19
Correspondence	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One-On-One	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	4
Phone	0	1	1	6	2	11	0	0	1	22
Total All CRCSN	1	1	1	6	3	14	3	1	16	46

This table shows the number of replies entered for CRCSN notifications sent to the Regional Office. It does not include Notification Follow Up communications.

Number and Type of CRCSN Notification Follow Up Communications by County								
County	System Generated Letters	Correspondence	Email	One-on- One	Phone Calls	Total Notification Follow Up Communications		
Northeast	31				4	35		
Total	31	0	0	0	4	35		

This table does not include replies reported in CRCSN Notification Replies by Result tables

HCP Top Services						
Service Type	Number					
Nutrition and Diet						
Consultation	55					
Clinic Ortho/Rehab, HCP	32					
Clinic Neurology, HCP	30					
Respite Care	18					
Clinic Orthopedic, HCP	9					
Clinic Rehab, HCP	4					
DME	4					
Home and Environmental Modifications	2					
Assistive Devices and Technology	1					
Total	155					

HCP Top Referrals						
Referral Type	Number					
Community Health/Public						
Systems	4					
Community Family						
Support	3					
Community						
Health/Insurance	3					
Surgery : Orthopaedic-						
Pediatric	2					
Durable Medical Equip	1					
Endocrinology : Pediatric	1					
Neurology : Pediatric	1					
Total	15					

Top Ten Concerns							
Concerns	Number						
Clinic	48						
Health Medical Needs (Child)	47						
Nutrition/Feeding	34						
Insurance	23						
Financial	17						
Motor	16						
Medications	15						
Education	14						
Support Systems	13						
Other	12						
Total	239						

Northeast Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data, 2008-2009

Nu	mber of Community Encounters with Encounter Resul	t and Duration in Ho	urs
Group	Result	Total Encounters	Total Duration (Hours)
Community Health Provider	Collaboration Transpired	2	7
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	12	142
	Increased Awareness	4	16
	Increased Knowledge	11	30
	Initiated Networking	1	2
	Procedures/Policies established/developed/revised	2	8
Developmental Disability Agency	Collaboration Transpired	1	1
	Community Training	1	4
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	1	9
	Increased Awareness	1	1
	Increased Knowledge	1	2
	Staff Development	3	13
Education Partners	Collaboration Transpired	4	21
	Grant Writing	3	5
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	7	23
	Increased Awareness	3	9
	Increased Knowledge	2	3
	Initiated Networking	1	2
Family Network	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	Community Identification of CYSHCN 1	
,	Increased Knowledge	1	2
HCP Regional Team	Collaboration Transpired	1	3
•	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	3	70
	Increased Awareness	2	7
	Increased Knowledge	2	25
	Procedures/Policies established/developed/revised	2	10
	Staff Development	2	28
Other Community Partners	Collaboration Transpired	13	55
,	Community Training	7	28
	Grant Writing	8	16
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	33	71
	Increased Awareness	17	40
	Increased Knowledge	8	24
	Staff Development	1	2
Public Officials	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	3	8
	Increased Awareness	1	3
	Increased Knowledge	1	5
	Procedures/Policies established/developed/revised	1	3
	2.	167	693

Number of Outcome Types from Community Encounters					
Outcome Type	Total				
Family Participation	50				
Medical Home	58				
Insurance	36				
Screening	68				
Community Care	160				
Transition	20				
Regional Operations	105				
Total	497				

Northwest Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data October 2008 - September 2009

All Data Tables Record ONLY Clients Who Have Had At Least 1 Communication Entered in CHIRP Between October 2008 and September 2009

Number of HCP Clients by Level of Care Coordination and Number and Percent of Clients Having Primary Care Provider Documented

County	Level I			Level II			Level III			Total All Levels		
	# of Clients	# with PCP	% with PCP	# of Clients	# with PCP	% with PCP	# of Clients	# with PCP	% with PCP	# of Clients	# with PCP	% with PCP
Grand	22	3	14%	8	2	25%	1	1	100%	31	6	19%
Jackson			0%	3	1	0%				3	1	33%
Moffat	22	2	9%	13	8	62%				35	10	29%
Rio Blanco	12		0%	5	1	20%				17	1	6%
Routt	22	3	14%	39	14	36%	1	1	100%	62	18	29%
Northwest Region	78	8	10%	68	26	38%	2	2	100%	148	36	24%

Number of HCP Clients by Age on October 1, 2008 and Level of Care Coordination									
Program Level	Age Group	Grand	Jackson	Moffat	Rio Blanco	Routt	Total by Level and Age Group		
Level I									
Level I	0-12 months	11		14	8	13	46		
Level I	13 to 36 months	6		5	4	4	19		
Level I	3 to 5 years	1		2		3	6		
Level I	6 to 12 years	1					1		
Level I	13 to 17 years	1				2	3		
Level I	18 to 21 years	1					1		
Total Level I		21	0	21	12	22	76		
Level II									
Level II	0-12 months	2	1	2	1	5	11		
Level II	13 to 36 months	1			1	7	9		
Level II	3 to 5 years		1	3		7	11		
Level II	6 to 12 years	3		5	3	13	24		
Level II	13 to 17 years	1	2	2		6	11		
Level II	18 to 21 years	1		1		2	4		
Total Level II		8	4	13	5	40	70		
Level III									
Level III	0-12 months						0		
Level III	13 to 36 months						0		
Level III	3 to 5 years						0		
Level III	6 to 12 years						0		
Level III	13 to 17 years	1				1	2		
Level III	18 to 21 years						0		
Total Level III		1	0	0	0	1	2		
Total Northwest Region		30	4	34	17	63	148		

Number of Documented Types of Insurance by HCP Client Level of Care Coordination									
Program Level	Insurance Type	Grand	Jackson	Moffat	Rio Blanco	Routt	Total Insurance by Level		
Level I									
Level I	CHP+	1		1	1		3		
Level I	Medicaid	3		8		6	17		
Level I	No Insurance					1	1		
Level I	Private Insurance	3		1		3	7		
Total Level I		7	0	10	1	10	28		
Level II									
Level II	CHP+	1		3		6	10		
Level II	Medicaid	2	1	14	4	11	32		
Level II	No Insurance	1		1	1		3		
Level II	Private Insurance	2	2	5	2	17	28		
Total Level II		6	3	23	7	34	73		
Level III		·				·			
Level III	Medicaid	1				·	1		
Level III	Private Insurance					1	1		
Total Level III		1	0	0	0	1	2		
Total Northwest Region		14	3	33	8	45	103		

Note: Clients can have several types of insurance active at the same time in CHIRP. This table is <u>not</u> a count of clients; it is a count of insurance types entered into CHIRP for active clients. A child can have an open category of no insurance at the same time as Medicaid, CHP+ or private insurance in the database. Each of those types is reported here. Insurance types *HCP, Private Pay, Self Pay* and *No Insurance* are included in the *No Insurance* lines.

Northwest Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data, 2008-2009

Number of HCP Clients by Gender and Level of Care Coordination

Program Level	Gender	Grand	Jackson	Moffat	Rio Blanco	Routt	Total Level by Gender
Level I	Female	7		8	3	6	24
Level I	Male	13		14	9	16	52
Total Level I		20	0	22	12	22	76
Level II	Female	2	2	6	1	19	30
Level II	Male	6	2	7	4	21	40
Total Level II		8	4	13	5	40	70
Level III	Female						0
Level III	Male	1				1	2
Total Level III		1	0	0	0	1	2
	Female	9	2	14	4	25	54
Total Northwest Region	Male	20	2	21	13	38	94
· ·	Combined	29	4	35	17	63	148

Number of HCP Clients by Ethnicity and Level of Care Coordination

Program Level	Ethnicity	Grand	Jackson	Moffat	Rio Blanco	Routt County	Total Level by Ethnicity
Level I	Hispanic			2		1	3
Level I	Non Hispanic	3		1		1	5
Total Level I		3	0	3	0	2	8
Level II	Chinese					1	1
Level II	Hispanic			3		2	5
Level II	Non Hispanic	4	3	9	2	20	38
Total Level II		4	3	12	2	23	44
Level III	Non Hispanic	1				1	2
Total Level III		1	0	0	0	1	2
Total Northwest Region		8	3	15	2	26	54

Number of HCP Clients by Race and Level of Care Coordination

Program Level	Race	Grand	Jackson	Moffat	Rio Blanco	Routt	Total by Level by Race
Level I	Caucasian/White	5				2	7
Total Level I		5	0	0	0	2	7
Level II	Afro-American/Black					1	1
Level II	Caucasian/White	3	2	8	2	16	31
Level II	H (Hispanic)			1			1
Level II	Not Specified			1			1
Total Level II		3	2	10	2	17	34
Level III	Caucasian/White	1				1	2
Total Level III		1	0	0	0	1	2
Total Northwest Region		9	2	10	2	20	43

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result

		CRCSN Not	tification Repli	es by Comm	<u>unication R</u>	<u>Result</u>				
County	Already in Non-HCP Services	Child Out of Home	Diagnosis Low Priority	Family Has No Concerns	HCP Level I	HCP Level	Lost to Follow Up	No Capacity	No Response from Family	Total
Child Known to HCP at Time of C	CRCSN Notification									
Grand										
No Communications	1									1
Correspondence										0
Consultation										0
One-On-One										0
Phone				1						1
Total Grand County	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Jackson										
No Communications									-	0
Correspondence Consultation										0
One-On-One										0
Phone										0
Total Jackson County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moffat	, , ,	·	·	·	- ŭ	- ŭ			·	·
No Communications										0
Correspondence										0
Consultation										0
One-On-One										0
Phone					1					1
Total Moffat County	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Rio Blanco										
No Communications										0
Correspondence					ļ					0
Consultation										0
One-On-One	1			1						1
Phone	1				<u> </u>					1
Total Rio Blanco County	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Routt										0
No Communications Correspondence			 	1					-	0
Consultation										0
One-On-One						1				1
Phone						'				0
Total Routt County	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total Known	2	Ö	Ö	2	1	1	0	0	0	6
				_					·	,
Child Unknown to HCP at Time of Grand	or CRCSN Notification									
No Communications								1	2	3
Correspondence										0
Consultation										0
One-On-One				2		4	1		0	4
Phone				2			•		2	5
Total Grand County	0	0	0	2	0	4	1	1	4	12
Jackson No Communications										0
Correspondence										0
Consultation										0
One-On-One										0
Phone										Ö
Total Jackson County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moffat		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	i -	i					
No Communications		Ì	1							1
Correspondence							1		4	5
Consultation										0
One-On-One										0
Phone	1			4					1	6
Total Moffat County	1	0	1	4	0	0	1	0	5	12
Rio Blanco										
No Communications			1						2	3
Correspondence									2	2
Consultation				1						11
One-On-One	4			1						1
Phone	1	_		_			•			1
Total Rio Blanco County	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	8
Routt No Communications										^
No Communications Correspondence					-					0
Correspondence Consultation	1	1	 	1	1				-	4
One-On-One	1	'		<u> </u>	1					1
Phone	3			1	<u> </u>					4
Total Routt County	4	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	9
Total Unknown	6	1	2	10	2	4	2	1	13	41
Total CRCSN - Region - Known		·	_	.,		*				.,
No Communications		0	0	0	0	0	0	4		0
Correspondence	1 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8 7
Consultation	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
One-On-One	0	0	0	2	1	5	0	0	0	8
Phone	6	0	Ö	8	1	0	1	0	3	19
Total CRCSN Results	8	1	2	12	3	5	2	1	13	47
						lotification Fo				.,

This table shows the number of replies entered for CRCSN notifications sent to the Regional Office. It does not include Notification Follow Up communications.

Number and Type of CRCSN Notification Follow Up Communications by County						
County	System Generated Letters	Correspondence	Email	One-on-One	Phone Calls	l otal Notification Follow Up Communications
Grand	2	1			1	4
Moffat	13				1	14
Jackson						0
Rio Blanco	5					5
Routt	1					1
Total	21	1	0	0	2	24

This table does not include replies reported in CRCSN Notification Replies by Result tables.

Number of Cor	mmunity Encounters with Encounter Result and D	uration in Hours	
Group	Result	Total Encounters	Total Duration (hours)
Community Health Provider	Collaboration Transpired	32	57
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	2	4
	Increased Awareness	40	43
	Increased Knowledge	10	15
	Initiated Networking	4	4
	Procedures/Policies established/developed/revised	6	7
	Staff Development	12	22
Developmental Disability Agency	Collaboration Transpired	5	8
. , , , ,	Increased Awareness	7	6
	Increased Knowledge	1	1
Education Partners	Collaboration Transpired	3	6
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	1	5
	Increased Awareness	4	7
	Increased Knowledge	3	4
	Staff Development	3	5
Family Network	Collaboration Transpired	1	4
HCP Regional Team	Collaboration Transpired	10	24
	Grant Writing	1	1
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	2	2
	Increased Awareness	8	7
	Increased Knowledge	3	2
	Procedures/Policies established/developed/revised	8	7
Other Community Partners	Collaboration Transpired	30	40
	Community Training	3	10
	Grant Writing	1	1
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	2	11
	Increased Awareness	10	12
	Increased Knowledge	12	27
	Initiated Networking	2	2
	Procedures/Policies established/developed/revised	1	2
Public Officials	Collaboration Transpired	2	4
Third Party Payers	Collaboration Transpired	1	1
Total		230	347

Top 10 Services		
Service Type	Total Number	
Health Systems Navigation	15	
Education Materials	13	
Nutrition and Diet Consultation	12	
Health Insurance Assistance	10	
Nursing Assessment and Consultation	10	
Basic Needs Systems Navigation	9	
Respite Care	5	
School Problem Solving and Support	5	
Basic Needs Problem Solving	4	
Developmental Monitoring	4	
Total	87	

Number of Outcome Types from Community Encounters			
Outcome Type	Total Number		
Family Participation	50		
Medical Home	58		
Insurance	36		
Screening	68		
Community Care	160		
Transition	20		
Regional Operations	105		
Total	497		

Number of Community Encounters by County			
County	Total Encounters		
Grand County Nrsg Srv	11		
Jackson County Nrsg Srv	3		
Moffat County NWCOVNA	10		
Rio Blanco County Nursing Service, Rangely	4		
Routt County NWCOVNA	202		
Total	230		

HCP Top 10 Referrals				
Referral Type	Total Number			
Community Health/Public Systems	14			
Community Family Support	12			
Community Health/Insurance	10			
Community Education	6			
Early Intervention	4			
Child Find	2			
HCP Regional Office	2			
Interpreter	2			
Occupational Therapist	2			
Pediatrician	2			
Total	56			

HCP Top 10 Concerns				
Concern	Total Number			
Health Medical Needs (Child)	32			
Nutrition/Feeding	27			
Support Systems	15			
Speech-language	14			
Financial	13			
Motor	11			
Cognitive	10			
Education	10			
Behavior/Emotional (Child)	9			
Family Relationships	9			
Insurance	9			
Total	159			

Pueblo Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data October 2008 - September 2009

All Data Tables Record ONLY Clients Who Have Had At Least 1 Communication Entered in CHIRP Between October 2008 and September 2009

Number of HCP Clients by Level of Care Coordination and Number and Percent of Clients Having Primary Care Provider Documented					
	# with % with				
	Total	PCP	PCP		
Level I	267	36	13%		
Level II	292	224	77%		
Level III	2	1	50%		
Total	561	261	47%		

HCP Clients by Race and Level of Care Coordination		
	Total	
Level I		
American Indian/Alaskan	1	
Caucasian/White	21	
Not Specified	1	
Other	2	
Total Level I	25	
Level II		
Asian	1	
Caucasian/White	77	
H (Hispanic)	2	
Not Specified	8	
Other	13	
Total Level II	101	
Level III		
Total Level III	0	
Total All Levels	126	

Number of Documented Types of Insurance & HCP Client Level of Care Coordination		
	Coordination	
Level I		
CHP+	1	
Medicaid	32	
No Insurance	5	
Private Insurance	5	
Total Level I	43	
Level II		
CHP+	5	
Medicaid	171	
No Insurance	32	
Private Insurance	40	
Total Level II	248	
Level III		
CHP+		
Medicaid	1	
No Insurance Private Insurance		
Total Level III	1	
Total All Levels	292	
	<u></u>	
Total By Insurance		
CHP+	6	
Medicaid	204	
No Insurance	37	
Private Insurance	45	
Total By Insurance Type	292	

Note: Clients can have several types of insurance active at the same time in CHIRP. This table is <u>not</u> a count of clients; it is a count of insurance types entered into CHIRP for active clients. A child can have an open category of no insurance at the same time as Medicaid, CHP+ or private insurance in the database. Each of those types is reported here. Insurance types HCP, Private Pay, Self Pay and No Insurance are included in the No Insurance lines.

Number of HCP Clients by Age on October 1, 2008 and Level of Care Coordination		
Level I		
0-12 months	142	
13 to 36 months	48	
3 to 5 years	13	
6 to 12 years	27	
13 to 17 years	18	
18 to 21 years	9	
Total Level I	257	
Level II		
0-12 months	36	
13 to 36 months	54	
3 to 5 years	31	
6 to 12 years	101	
13 to 17 years	51	
18 to 21 years	29	
Total Level II	302	
Levell III		
0-12 months		
13 to 36 months		
3 to 5 years		
6 to 12 years		
13 to 17 years	2	
18 to 21 years		
Total Level III	2	
Total All Levels 561		

Number of HCP Clients by Gender and Level of Care Coordination											
Level I											
Female	120										
Male	133										
Unk	1										
Total Level I	254										
Level II											
Female	120										
Male	169										
Total Level II	289										
Level III											
Male	1										
Female	1										
Total Level III	2										
Total All Levels	545										

Level I	
Hispanic	11
Non Hispanic	14
Unknown	1
Total Level I	26
Level II	
Hispanic	53
Non Hispanic	46
Unknown	4
Total Level II	103
Level III	
Hispanic	
Non Hispanic	
Unknown	
Total Level III	0

Pueblo Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data, 2008-2009

HCP Top Services										
Service Type	Number									
Clinic Neurology, HCP	81									
Clinic Rehab, HCP	56									
Clinic Genetic - HCP	47									
Clinic Orthopedic, HCP	10									
Clinic Ortho/Rehab, HCP	6									
Genetic Services	1									
Total	201									

HCP Top Referrals	
Referral Type	Number
Community Education	2
Community Health/Public Systems	1
Total	3

	Number of Community Encounters with Encou	ınter Result			
	Result	Total Encounters	Total Duration (hours)		
Community Health Provider	Collaboration Transpired	1	2		
	Community Training	2	2		
	Increased Knowledge	3	4		
Developmental Disability Agency	Collaboration Transpired	3	4		
	Community Training	1	5		
	Procedures/Policies established/developed/revised	1	1		
Education Partners	Collaboration Transpired	2	4		
	Community Training	1	2		
	Increased Awareness	1	1		
	Increased Knowledge	2	4		
HCP Regional Team	Increased Knowledge	1	2		
Other Community Partners	Collaboration Transpired	5	6		
	Community Training	3	7		
	Grant Writing	2	7		
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	2	2		
	Increased Awareness	5	8		
	Increased Knowledge	2	5		
	Procedures/Policies established/developed/revised	1	1		
Total		38	64		

Number of Outcome Types from Community Encounters												
Outcome Type	Total											
Family Participation	16											
Medical Home	24											
Insurance	10											
Screening	22											
Community Care	35											
Transition	14											
Regional Operations	17											
Total	138											

Top Ten	Concerns
Concerns	Total
Health Medical Needs (Child)	55
Clinic	49
Behavior/Emotional (Child)	16
Education	15
Medications	12
Motor	11
Speech-language	9
Transitions	9
Insurance	8
Nutrition/Feeding	8
Total	192

Pueblo Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data, 2008-2009

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result
Child Known to HCP at time of CRCSN Notification
Diagnosis Low
HCP Level I II/III Already in Non-HCP No Response Services Child out of Home Lost to Follow-up from Family Total Type No Communications 24 Correspondence 3 Consultation One-On-One Phone 1 Total 32 Child Not Known to HCP at time of CRCSN Notification
Diagnosis Low Family has No Lost to No Response from Family Already in Non-HCP Priority concerns HCP Level II/III Follow-up No Capacity Total Type Services No Communications 103 12 Correspondence 14 Consultation 0 One-On-One 12 17 Phone 74 135 Total 21

	Total (CRCSN - Region - Know	wn and Unknown Com	bined		
All CRCSN Communication Results	No Communications	Correspondence	Consultation	One-On-One	Phone	Total
Already in Non-HCP Services	8	1		1	13	23
Child out of Home	1			1		2
Diagnosis Low Priority	8					8
Family has No concerns					4	4
HCP Level I	5	1	1			7
HCP Level II/III	6	2				8
Lost to Follow-up	7	15			1	23
No Capacity	9					9
No Response from Family	83					83
Total CRCSN Communications	127	19	1	2	18	167

This table shows the number of replies entered for CRCSN notifications sent to the Regional Office. It does not include Notification Follow up Communications.

Number and Type of CRCSN Notifications Follow Up by County													
System Generated Follow Up													
County	Letters	Correspondence	Email	One-on-One	Phone Calls	Communications							
Pueblo	202					202							
Total	202	0	0	0	0	202							

This table does not include replies reported in CRCSN Notification Replies by Result tables

South Central Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data October 2008 - September 2009

All Data Tables Record ONLY Clients Who Have Had At Least 1 Communication Entered in CHIRP Between October 2008 and September 2009

	Number of HCP Clients by Level of Care Coordination and Number and Percent of Clients Having Primary Care Provider Documented													
County		Level I			Level II			Level III			Total All Le	vels		
	# of Clients	# with PCP	% with PCP	# of Clients	# with PCP	% with PCP	# of Clients	# with PCP	% with PCP	# of Clients	# with PCP	% with PCP		
Alamosa	32	5	16%	99	67	68%				131	72	55%		
Chaffee	4		0%	20	8	40%	1	1	100%	25	9	36%		
Conejos	5	1	20%	76	69	91%				81	70	86%		
Costilla	4	1	25%	28	23	82%		i !		32	24	75%		
Custer				1		0%				1	0	0%		
Fremont	44	3	7%	60	25	42%				104	28	27%		
Huerfano	9		0%	7	2	29%				16	2	13%		
Lake	5	1	20%	12	6	50%				17	7	41%		
Las Animas	13	1	8%	26	18	69%		i !		39	19	49%		
Mineral				4	4	100%				4	4	100%		
Rio Grande	14	2	14%	103	81	79%		<u> </u>		117	83	71%		
Saguache	6	1	17%	37	29	78%				43	30	70%		
South Central Region	136	15	11%	473	332	70%	1	1	100%	610	348	57%		

	Number of HCP Clients by Race and Level of Care Coordination														
Program Level	Race	Alamosa	Chaffee	Conejos	Costilla	Fremont	Huerfano	Lake	Las Animas	Mineral	Rio Grande	Saguache	South Central Regional Office	Total Race by Level	
Level I	Caucasian/White	3				1					1		1	6	
Level I	Hispanic											1		1	
Level I	Other							1			1			2	
Level I Total		3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	9	
Level II	Afro-American/Black								1					1	
Level II	American Indian/Alaskan	2							1		4	1		8	
Level II	Asian					1								1	
Level II	Austrailian - Caucasian			1							1			2	
Level II	Caucasian/White	22	6	31	7	12	2	4	8	3	48	14		157	
Level II	Hawaiian	1												1	
Level II	Not Specified	6		3	3	1			1	1	4			19	
Level II	Other	13	1	19	8			1	7		14	7		70	
Level II Total		44	7	54	18	14	2	5	18	4	71	22	0	259	
Level III	Not Specified		1											1	
Level III Total		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Grand Total		47	8	54	18	15	2	6	18	4	73	23	1	269	

	Number of HCP Clients by Age on October 1, 2008 and Level of Care Coordination														
Program Level	Age Group	Alamosa	Chaffee	Conejos	Costilla	Custer	Fremont	Huerfano	Lake	Las Animas	Mineral	Rio Grande	Saguache	South Central	Total Age by Level
Level I	0-12 months	9	4	2	1	1	22	4	2	9		6	1		61
Level I	13 to 36 months	9		1	2		10	4	1	3		2	3	1	36
Level I	3 to 5 years	2					1	1		1		1			6
Level I	6 to 12 years	4			1		4					1	1		11
Level I	13 to 17 years	2					3						1		6
Level I	18 to 21 years	2		2			1		1			1			7
Level I Total		28	4	5	4	1	41	9	4	13	0	11	6	1	127
Level II	0-12 months	19	5	2	3		17	3	2	3		7	4		65
Level II	13 to 36 months	8	3	4	1	1	9		1	4		11	1		43
Level II	3 to 5 years	12	1	7			8				1	17	3		49
Level II	6 to 12 years	33	5	27	12		14	2	6	6	1	44	10	1	161
Level II	13 to 17 years	17	6	15	5		7		2	5		14	12		83
Level II	18 to 21 years	14		20	7		6	2	2	8	2	11	9		81
Level II Total		103	20	75	28	1	61	7	13	26	4	104	39	1	482
Level III	0-12 months														0
Level III	13 to 36 months														0
Level III	3 to 5 years														0
Level III	6 to 12 years		1				_		-		-	_			1
Level III	13 to 17 years								•				•		0
Level III	18 to 21 years								•						0

	Number of Documented Types of Insurance and Level of Care Coordination of HCP Clients														
Program Level	InsuranceType	Alamosa	Chaffee	Conejos	Costilla	Custer	Fremont	Huerfano	Lake	Las Animas	Mineral	Rio Grande	Saguache	South Central	Total Insurance Type by Level
Level I	Medicaid	7		1	1				1			4			14
Level I	No Insurance	1										2			3
Level I	Private Insurance	2					1								3
Level I Total		10	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	6	0	0	20
Level II	CHP+	3	1	4	1		4			3	1	6	3		26
Level II	Medicaid	50	6	55	24		20	2	3	20	2	61	18	1	262
Level II	No Insurance	21	3	33	13		11		5	12	1	27	11		137
Level II	Private Insurance	11	2	10			5	1	1	6	1	13	6		56
Level II Total		85	12	102	38	0	40	3	9	41	5	107	38	1	481
Level III	Medicaid		1												1
Level III	No Insurance		1												1
Level III Total		0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Grand Total		95	14	103	39	0	41	3	10	41	5	113	38	1	503

115

102

Level III Total Grand Total

131

25

Note: Clients can have several types of insurance active at the same time in CHIRP. This table is <u>not</u> a count of clients; it is a count of insurance types entered into CHIRP for active clients. A child can have an open category of no insurance at the same time as Medicaid, CHP+ or private insurance in the database. Each of those types is reported here. Insurance types HCP, Private Pay, Self Pay and No Insurance are included in the No Insurance lines.

	Number of HCP Clients by Gender and Level of Care Coordination														
Program Level	Gender	Alamosa	Chaffee	Conejos	Costilla	Custer	Fremont	Huerfano	Lake	Las Animas	Mineral	Rio Grande	Saguache	South Central	Total Level by Gender
Level I	Female	7			2		10	2	4	6		4		1	36
Level I	Male	14	4	3			32	7		6		5	2		73
Level I Total		21	4	3	2	0	42	9	4	12	0	9	2	1	109
Level II	Female	34	10	31	10		20	3	7	9	1	43	15		183
Level II	Male	49	4	39	16	1	34	2	4	14	3	42	16	1	225
Level II Total		83	14	70	26	1	54	5	11	23	4	85	31	1	408
Level III	Female														0
Level III	Male		1												1
Level III Total		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Grand Total		104	19	73	28	1	96	14	15	35	4	94	33	2	518

					Numb	er of HCP Client	s by Ethnicit	y and Level of	Care Co	oordination					
Program Level	Ethnicity	Alamosa	Chaffee	Conejos	Costilla	Custer	Fremont	Huerfano	Lake	Las Animas	Mineral	Rio Grande	Saguache	South Central	Total Level by Ethnicity
Level I	Hispanic	1							1	1		2		1	6
Level I	Non Hispanic	2					1								3
Level I Total		3	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	0	1	9
Level II	Hispanic	35	1	37	15		2	1	2	12		47	18		170
Level II	Non Hispanic	12	6	21	2		11		4	6	4	23	9		98
Level II	Unknown	1													1
Level II Total		48	7	58	17	0	13	1	6	18	4	70	27	0	269
Level III	Non Hispanic		1												1
Level III Total		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Grand Total		51	8	58	17	0	14	1	7	19	4	72	27	1	279

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result

Child Known to HCP at time of CRCSN Notification by Communication Type & Result

County	Already in Non-HCP Services	Child Out of Home	Family Has No Concerns	HCP Level I	HCP Level II/III	Lost to Follow Up	No Response from Family	Total Known
Alamosa								
No Communications					i		i	0
Correspondence						1		1
Consultation								0
One-On-One								0
Phone		1			1			2
Total Alamosa County	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3
Chaffee	-						-	
No Communications								0
Correspondence								0
Consultation					İ		İ	0
One-On-One			1					1
Phone								Ö
Total Chaffee County	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Conejos				-	-			
No Communications								0
Correspondence								0
Consultation								0
One-On-One								0
Phone								Ö
Total Conejos County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Costilla					Ţ.	,	,	,
No Communications								0
Correspondence								0
Consultation								0
One-On-One								0
Phone								ő
Total Costilla County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Custer	Ü	Ů	Ü		,	Ů	Ţ.	,
No Communications								0
Correspondence								0
Consultation								0
One-On-One								0
Phone								0
Total Custer County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fremont	•	•	·	•	<u> </u>	•		, and the second
No Communications	1		1		3	3	:	8
Correspondence			•		-	-		0
Consultation								0
One-On-One					1			1
Phone		1	1					2
Total Fremont County	1	1	2	0	4	3	0	11
Huerfano			-	-	·	-	-	
No Communications								0
Correspondence								0
Consultation								0
One-On-One								0
Phone							1	ĭ
Total Huerfano County	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total Hachano County	Ū	U	U	U	ı v	U	'	

Child Known to HCP at time of CRCSN Notification by Communication Type & Result

County	Already in Non-HCP Services	Child Out of Home	Family Has No Concerns	HCP Level I	HCP Level II/III	Lost to Follow Up	No Response from Family	Total Known
Lake								
No Communications	-							0
Correspondence	į							0
Consultation								0
One-On-One							į	0
Phone								0
Total Lake County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Las Animas								
No Communications	1					1		1
Correspondence	i							0
Consultation	İ							0
One-On-One								0
Phone								0
Total Las Animas County	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Mineral								
No Communications								0
Correspondence	i							0
Consultation	1						i	0
One-On-One	1							0
Phone	1						İ	0
Total Mineral County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rio Grande								
No Communications				1				1
Correspondence	i						i	0
Consultation	İ						!	0
One-On-One	1							0
Phone		İ					i	0
Total Rio Grande County	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Saguache		-					-	
No Communications								0
Correspondence	1					1		1
Consultation	i							0
One-On-One								0
Phone								0
Total Saguache County	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
South Central Region		-		-			-	
No Communications	1	0	1	1	3	4	0	10
Correspondence	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One-On-One	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Phone	Ö	2	i	Ö	i	Ö	ĭ	5
Total Known	1	2	3	1	5	6	1	19
I OLAI KIIOWII	1	2	3	1	D D	ō	1	19

This table shows the number of replies entered for CRCSN notifications sent to the Regional Office. It does not include Notification Follow Up communications.

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result

Child Unknown to HCP at time of CRCSN Notification by Communication Type & Result

County	Already in Non-HCP Services	Child Out of Home	Family Has No Concerns	HCP Level I	HCP Level II/III	Lost to Follow Up	Moved Out of State	No Response from Family	Total Unknown	Combined Known and Unknown
Alamosa						l				
No Communications		!				1			0	0
Correspondence			2			4		1	7	8
Consultation										0
One-On-One		į i	i			i	i			0
Phone	2	1	2	1	1			1	8	10
Total Alamosa County	2	1	4	1		4	0	2	15	18
Chaffee										
No Communications			1			3		1	5	5
Correspondence						1			1	1
Consultation			i			l				0
One-On-One					1					1
Phone			1						1	1
Total Chaffee County	0	0	2	0	1	4	0	1	7	8
Conejos										
No Communications								1	1	1
Correspondence									0	0
Consultation										0
One-On-One						İ			_	0
Phone			1						1	1
Total Conejos County	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	2
Costilla										
No Communications									0	0
Correspondence									0	0
Consultation						i				0
One-On-One										0
Phone									0	0
Total Costilla County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Custer										
No Communications						1			0	0
Correspondence									0	0
Consultation										0
One-On-One						į.				0
Phone									0	0
Total Custer County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fremont										
No Communications						18	1		19	27
Correspondence						!			0	0
Consultation						ł				0
One-On-One										1
Phone	2	1	12	1		1			17	19
Total Fremont County	2	1	12	1	0	19	1	0	36	47
Huerfano										
No Communications				-		2	-	-	2	2
Correspondence				-			-	1	1	1
Consultation						i				0
One-On-One						i				0
Phone			1			1			2	3
Total Huerfano County	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	1	5	6
Lake										
No Communications				-			-	-	0	0
Correspondence				`		i			0	0
Consultation						İ				0
One-On-One										0
Phone	ļ		3			2			5	5
Total Lake County	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	5	5
Las Animas										
No Communications								1	1	2
Correspondence				`		1		1	1	1
Consultation				`						0
One-On-One									_	0
Phone	1		5					1	7	7
Total Las Animas County	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	9	10

Child Unknown to HCP at time of CRCSN Notification by Communication Type & Resu	

County	Already in Non-HCP Services	Child Out of Home	Family Has No Concerns	HCP Level I	HCP Level II/III	Lost to Follow Up	Moved Out of State	No Response from Family	Total Unknown	Combined Known and Unknown
Mineral										
No Communications									0	0
Correspondence									0	0
Consultation										0
One-On-One							1			0
Phone							i		0	0
Total Mineral County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rio Grande										
No Communications									0	1
Correspondence						4			4	4
Consultation							İ			0
One-On-One										0
Phone	2					1			3	3
Total Rio Grande County	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	7	8
Saguache										
No Communications									0	0
Correspondence				i			i		0	1
Consultation										0
One-On-One										0
Phone									0	0
Total Saguache County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
South Central Region										
No Communications	0	0	1	0	0	23	1	3	28	38
Correspondence	0	0	2	0	0	9	0	3	14	16
Consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One-On-One	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3
Phone	7	2	25	2	1	5	0	2	44	49
Total Known and Unknown	7	2	28	2	2	37	1	8	87	106

This table shows the number of replies entered for CRCSN notifications sent to the Regional Office. It does not include Notification Follow Up communications.

	Number and	Type of CRCSN Notifica	ation Follow Up Commu	inications by County		
County	System Generated Letters	Correspondence	Email	One-on-One	Phone Calls	Total Notification Follow Up Communications
Alamosa		3			2	5
Chaffee					1	1
Conejos						0
Costilla						0
Custer						0
Fremont		43			11	54
Huerfano	8	4			10	22
Lake			1		7	8
Las Animas	2	1		1	7	11
Mineral						0
Rio Grande	9					9
Saguache	3					3
Total	22	51	1	1	38	113

This table does not include replies reported in CRCSN Notification Replies by Result tables

Number of Com	munity Encounters with Encounter Result and Duration	on in Hours	
Group	Result	Total Encounters	Total Duration (hours)
Community Health Provider	Collaboration Transpired	11	23
	Increased Knowledge	2	4
	Initiated Networking	2	4
Developmental Disability Agency	Collaboration Transpired	28	43
Education Partners	Collaboration Transpired	7	12
	Increased Awareness	2	5
	Increased Knowledge	3	6
Family Network	Collaboration Transpired	3	8
HCP Regional Team	Collaboration Transpired	20	49
	Community Training	1	1
	Increased Awareness	13	12
	Increased Knowledge	5	15
	Procedures/Policies established/developed/revised	5	23
	Staff Development	17	78
NULL	Collaboration Transpired	1	2
Other Community Partners	Collaboration Transpired	12	30
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	1	2
	Increased Knowledge	1	5
	Initiated Networking	2	4
Public Officials	Collaboration Transpired	3	8
	Increased Knowledge	2	4
	Initiated Networking	1	3
	Procedures/Policies established/developed/revised	2	2
Total	·	144	339

HC	HCP Top Concerns							
Referral Type	Total Number							
Motor	14							
Education	13							
Behavior/Emotional (Child)	11							
Support Systems	10							
Speech-language	7							
Financial	6							
Health Medical Needs (Family)	6							
Clinic	5							
Family Relationships	5							
Total	77							

Note: No referrals reported for South Central region.

Number of Outcome Types from Community Encounters								
Outcome Type	Total Number							
Family Participation	22							
Medical Home	33							
Insurance	5							
Screening	24							
Community Care	67							
Transition	17							
Regional Operations	78							
Total	246							

Number of Community Encounters	by County
County	Total Encounters
Alamosa County Nursing Service	8
Chaffee County Public Health	1
Costilla County Nursing Service	1
Fremont County Nursing Service	1
Huerfano Counties District Hlth Dept	13
Lake County Public Health Nursing Service	1
Las Animas Dist Health Dept	5
Mineral County Nrsg Service	3
South Central Regional Office	111
Total	144

HCP Top Services	
Service Type	Total Number
Assistive Devices and Technology	5
Education Materials	4
Adaptive devices	1
Co-payments for Insurance	1
Cognitive Therapy	1
Neuromedical Treatment	1
Visual Impairment Treatment	1
Total	14

Southeast Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data October 2008 - September 2009

All Data Tables Record ONLY Clients Who Have Had At Least 1 Communication Entered in CHIRP Between October 2008 and September 2009

					á	Level of Care						
		Nu	mber and F	Percent of C	lients Havii	ng Primary Ca	re Provider	Documente	ed			
County Level I Level II Level III Total All Levels										els		
	# of Clients	# with PCP	% with PCP	# of Clients	# with PCP	% with PCP	# of Clients	# with PCP	% with PCP	# of Clients	# with PCP	% with PCP
Baca	2			9	7	78%		l		11	7	64%
Bent	4	4	100%	25	17	68%	1	1	100%	30	22	73%
Cheyenne	3	i	0%	1	i i	0%		į		4	0	0%
Crowley	6	2	33%	18	17	94%		i .		24	19	79%
Kiowa				2		0%		į		2	0	0%
Kit Carson	1		0%	9		0%		İ		10	0	0%
Lincoln	2	į –	0%	3	i	0%				5	0	0%
Otero	20	8	40%	83	62	75%		į		103	70	68%
Prowers	9	2	22%	57	41	72%		į		66	43	65%
Southeast Region	47	16	34%	207	144	70%	1	1	100%	255	161	63%

			Nui		lients by Age and of Care Coord	on October 1, 2 lination	2008				
Program Level	Age Group	Baca	Bent	Cheyenne	Crowley	Kiowa	Kit Carson	Lincoln	Otero	Prowers	Total by Level and Age Group
Level I	0-12 months	1		1	3				3	2	10
Level I	13 to 36 months	1	2	2			1	2	6	1	15
Level I	3 to 5 years		1							2	3
Level I	6 to 12 years				1				6		7
Level I	13 to 17 years								1	3	4
Level I	18 to 21 years								1		1
Level I Total		2	3	3	4	0	1	2	17	8	40
Level II	0-12 months	3	5	1	2	1	5	1	21	15	54
Level II	13 to 36 months		7		2		4		10	9	32
Level II	3 to 5 years		3		3			2	13	9	30
Level II	6 to 12 years	4	7		7				26	16	60
Level II	13 to 17 years	2	4		3				14	10	33
Level II	18 to 21 years				2	1			1	1	5
Level II Total		9	26	1	19	2	9	3	85	60	214
Level III	0-12 months										0
Level III	13 to 36 months										0
Level III	3 to 5 years										0
Level III	6 to 12 years										0
Level III	13 to 17 years							Ť	•		0
Level III	18 to 21 years				1				•		1
Level III Total		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total All Levels		11	29	4	24	2	10	5	102	68	255

			Number o		Types of Insu of Care Coord	rance for HCP	Clients by				
Program Level	InsuranceType	Baca	Bent	Cheyenne	Crowley	Kiowa	Kit Carson	Lincoln	Otero	Prowers	Total Insurance by Level
Level I	CHP+								2		2
Level I	Medicaid	1	2	1	2				6	2	14
Level I	No Insurance								2	1	3
Level I	Private Insurance								3	1	4
Level I Total		1	2	1	2	0	0	0	13	4	23
Level II	CHP+		1			1			4	4	10
Level II	Medicaid	14	24		18				54	51	161
Level II	No Insurance	4	4		1	1			9	9	28
Level II	Private Insurance	1	6		2				16	7	32
Level II Total		19	35	0	21	2	0	0	83	71	231
Level III	Medicaid	İ			1					i	1
Level III Total		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total All Levels		20	37	1	24	2	0	0	96	75	255

Note: Clients can have several types of insurance active at the same time in CHIRP. This table is not a count of clients; it is a count of insurance types entered into CHIRP. A child can have an open category of no insurance at the same time as Medicaid, CHP+ or private insurance in the database; each of those types is reported here. Insurance types HCP, Private Pay, Self Pay and No Insurance are included in the No Insurance lines.

Southeast Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data October 2008 - September 2009

All Data Tables Record ONLY Clients Who Have Had At Least 1 Communication Entered in CHIRP Between October 2008 and September 2009

	Number of HCP Clients by Race and Level of Care Coordination										
Program Level	Race	Baca	Bent	Cheyenne	Crowley	Kiowa	Kit Carson	Lincoln	Otero	Prowers	Total Level by Race
Level I	Caucasian/White	2	3	2	3		1	1	11	7	30
Level I Total		2	3	2	3	0	1	1	11	7	30
Level II	Caucasian/White	8	21		19	1	1	2	72	48	172
Level II	H (Hispanic)									1	1
Level II	Hispanic									2	2
Level II	Indian								1		1
Level II Total		8	21	0	19	1	1	2	73	51	176
Level III	Caucasian/White				1						1
Level III Total		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Grand Total		10	24	2	23	1	2	3	84	58	207

	Number of HCP Clients by Ethnicity and Level of Care Coordination										
Program Level	Ethnicity	Baca	Bent	Cheyenne	Crowley	Kiowa	Kit Carson	Lincoln	Otero	Prowers	Total Level by Ethnicity
Level I	Hispanic		2		1				7	3	13
Level I	Non Hispanic	2	1	2	1		1		4	2	13
Level I	Unknown									1	1
Level I Total		2	3	2	2	0	1	0	11	6	27
Level II	Hispanic		6		4				39	32	81
Level II	Non Hispanic	8	16		15	1	1	2	31	20	94
Level II Total		8	22	0	19	1	1	2	70	52	175
Level III	Non Hispanic				1						1
Level III Total		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Grand Total		10	25	2	22	1	2	2	81	58	203

	Number of HCP Clients by Gender and Level of Care Coordination										
Program Level	Gender	Baca	Bent	Cheyenne	Crowley	Kiowa	Kit Carson	Lincoln	Otero	Prowers	Total Level by Gender
Level I	Female	1	3		3				4	3	14
Level I	Male	1		3	1		1	2	14	5	27
Level I Total		2	3	3	4	0	1	2	18	8	41
Level II	Female	4	11		7		2	2	21	21	68
Level II	Male	5	15	1	12	2	7	1	63	39	145
Level II Total		9	26	1	19	2	9	3	84	60	213
Level III	Female				1						1
Level III	Male										
Level III Total		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Grand Total		11	29	4	24	2	10	5	102	68	255

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result

	Child		RCSN Notification Replie time of CRCSN Notification			ered in CHIRP			
County	Already in Non-HCP Services	Diagnosis Low Priority	Family Has No Concerns	HCP Level I	HCP Level II/III	Lost to Follow Up	Moved Out of State	No Response from Family	Total Known
Baca No Communications			1			1			0
Correspondence			İ			į			0
Consultation						İ			0
One-On-One Phone						1			0
Total Baca County	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Bent								J	
No Communications	1				1	i			2
Correspondence									0
Consultation						ļ			0
One-On-One Phone						<u> </u>			0
Total BentCounty	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Cheyenne			•		'	-		U	
No Communications									0
Correspondence									0
Consultation									0
One-On-One Phone						ļ			0
Total Cheyenne County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crowley			•		U	-		U	· ·
No Communications						†			0
Correspondence			1			İ			0
Consultation									0
One-On-One									0
Phone			_			_			0
Total Crowley County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Communications	1								1
Correspondence					! !	1			0
Consultation									0
One-On-One									0
Phone									0
Total Kiowa County	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Kit Carson No Communications		1							1
Correspondence						1			0
Consultation						ļ			0
One-On-One					1				1
Phone						ļ.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			0
Total Kit Carson County Lincoln	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
No Communications									0
Correspondence			 						0
Consultation									0
One-On-One									0
Phone								_	0
Total Lincoln County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Otero No Communications	1		1						2
Correspondence	'		 			!			0
Consultation									0
One-On-One	1				1				2
Phone	2	-							2
Total Otero County	4	00	1	00	1	0	0	0	6
Prowers No Communications					1	1		1	2
No Communications Correspondence					'	1		1	3 2
Consultation				1	1	· ·		·	2
One-On-One	1								1
Phone			1 1						0
Total Prowers County	1	0	0	1	2	2	0	2	8
Southeast Region - Total Known									
No Communications	3	1	1	0	2	1	0	1	9
Correspondence	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Consultation	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
One-On-One	2 2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	4
Phone									
Southeast Region - Total Known	7	1	1	1	5	3	0	2	20

This table shows the number of replies entered for CRCSN notifications sent to the Regional Office. It does not include Notification Follow Up communications.

		Child Unknown to	HCP at time of CRCS	N Notification b	Communication	ype a result			
County	Already in Non-HCP Services	Diagnosis Low Priority	Family Has No Concerns	HCP Level I	HCP Level II/III	Lost to Follow Up	Moved Out of State	No Response from Family	Total Unknow
aca lo Communications							I.		0
orrespondence onsultation				1				į .	0
One-On-One	+								0
hone							1		1
Total Baca County Bent	0	0	0	0		0	1	0	1
No Communications						1	i	1	1
Correspondence						2			2
Consultation One-On-One	-			ļ					0
Phone				į				i	ő
Total BentCounty	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
Cheyenne No Communications									0
Correspondence	- 							<u> </u>	0
Consultation									0
One-On-One Phone			1	ļ					0
Total Cheyenne County	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Crowley			<u> </u>			-	-		
No Communications									0
Correspondence Consultation	+			1	1				0
One-On-One									0
hone									0
Total Crowley County Glowa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Communications	1								0
Correspondence									0
Consultation One-On-One	-								0
Phone	1								1
Total Kiowa County	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Kit Carson No Communications				1			1	1	0
Correspondence			1						1
Consultation									0
One-On-One Phone		2		Ĭ .	1	1			1 4
Total Kit Carson County	0	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	6
incoln									
No Communications Correspondence									0
Consultation									ő
One-On-One									0
Phone Fotal Lincoln County	0	0	0	0	0	1 1	0	0	1
Otero	U	U	<u> </u>		Ů		U	,	
No Communications									0
Correspondence Consultation		1	1			1			3 0
One-On-One				İ					0
hone	2	1	1		1	1			6
Total Otero County	2	2	2	0	1	2	0	0	9
Prowers No Communications				1					0
Correspondence	1	İ		ĺ					0
Consultation One-On-One	1		<u> </u>		1	<u> </u>			0
Phone	3			1					3
Total Prowers County	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5
Southeast Region Total Unknown To Communications	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	1
Correspondence	0	1	2	0	0	3	0	0	6
Consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One-On-One	1	0	0 2	0	2	0	0	0	3 17
Phone Southeast Region Total Unknown	6 7	3 4	2 4	0	2 4	3	1	0	17 27
Southeast region rotal unknown		-		I Communicatio			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		- 41
lo Communications	3	1	1	0	2	2	0	1	10
Correspondence Consultation	0	0	0	0	0	4 0	0	0	8 2
One-On-One	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	7
Phone	8	3	2	0	2	4	1	0	20
otal All CRCSN Communications	14	5	5	1	9	10	1	2	47

This table shows the number of replies entered for CRCSN notifications sent to the Regional Office. It does not include Notification Follow Up communications.

	Number and Type of CRCSN	Notification Follow Up	Communication	s by Count	у				
County	System Generated Letters	Correspondence	Email	One-On- One	Phone Calls	Total Notification Follow Up Communications			
Bent	4		4		3	11			
Kiowa	1		1		1	3			
Kit Carson	4		2		3	9			
Licoln			1		1	2			
Otero	20	2	9		7	38			
Prowers	1		7			8			
Total	30	2	24	0	15	71			
This table does not include repl	s table does not include replies reported in CRCSN Notification Replies by Result tables.								

Numbe	er of Community Encounters with Encounter Result at	nd Duration in Hours	
Group	Result	Total Encounters	Total Duration (hours)
Community Health Provider	Community Training	1	3
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	1	2
Education Partners	Collaboration Transpired	2	3
	Community Training	1	4
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	1	2
	Increased Knowledge	4	6
	Initiated Networking	1	1
HCP Regional Team	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	1	1
	Increased Knowledge	3	13
	Initiated Networking	1	3
	Staff Development	1	2
Other Community Partners	Collaboration Transpired	1	2
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	1	3
	Increased Awareness	1	3
	Increased Knowledge	2	6
Total		22	51

Number of Outcome Types from Community Encounters						
Outcome Type	Total Number					
Family Participation	20					
Medical Home	21					
Insurance	13					
Screening	19					
Community Care	22					
Transition	14					
Regional Operations	19					
Total	128					

Community Encounters by County, Southeast						
County	Total Encounters					
Baca County Nursing Service	2					
Otero County Health	20					
Total	20					

	Top Services
Service Type	Total Number
Clinic Neurology, HCP	3
Clinic Pediatric, HCP	2
Total	5

Top Referrals						
Referral Type	Total Number					
Community Family Support	1					
Psychologist	1					
Total	2					

Top Ten Concerns							
Concerns	Total Number						
Health Medical Needs (Child)	110						
Behavior/Emotional (Child)	35						
Grief & Loss	19						
Speech-language	17						
Motor	16						
Nutrition/Feeding	14						
Support Systems	9						
Education	8						
Other	8						
Total	236						

Southwest Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data October 2008 - September 2009

All Data Tables Record ONLY Clients Who Have Had At Least 1 Communication Entered in CHIRP Between October 2008 and September 2009

	Number of HCP Clients by Level of Care Coordination and Number and Percent of Clients Having Primary Care Provider Documented											
County	Level I				Level II		Level III			Total All Levels		
	# of Clients	# with PCP	% with PCP	# of Clients	# with PCP	% with PCP	# of Clients	# with PCP	% with PCP	# of Clients	# with PCP	% with PCP
Archuleta	24	2	8%	6	6	100%			0	30	8	27%
Dolores	1		0%	3	3	100%			0	4	3	75%
La Plata	39	10	26%	65	46	71%			0	104	56	54%
Montezuma	35	1	3%	17	17	100%			0	52	18	35%
San Juan	2	0	0%		}				0	2	0	0%
Southwest Region	101	13	13%	91	72	79%	0	0	0	192	85	44%

	Number of HCP Clients by Race and Level of Care Coordination									
Program Level	Race	Montezuma	San Juan	Archuleta	La Plata	Total by Level by Race				
Level I	A (Asian)			1		1				
Level I	American Indian/Alaskan				1	1				
Level I	Caucasian/White	1		2	5	8				
Level I	Native American				3	3				
Level I	Other				1	1				
Total Level I		1	0	3	10	14				
Level II	American Indian/Alaskan	2			3	5				
Level II	Asian				1	1				
Level II	Caucasian/White	14	2	5	23	44				
Level II	Ethiopian				1	1				
Level II	Hispanic	2			1	3				
Level II	Native American	2			1	3				
Level II	Not Specified	2		2	2	6				
Level II	Other	1			1	2				
Total Level II		23	2	7	33	65				
No Level III data						0				
Total All Levels		24	2	10	43	79				

	Number of HCP Clients by Gender and Level of Care Coordination									
Program Level	Gender	Dolores	Montezuma	San Juan	Archuleta	La Plata	Total Level by Gender			
Level I	Female		1		8	11	20			
Level I	Male		9		3	19	31			
Level I Total		0	10	0	11	30	51			
Level II	Female		11		3	13	27			
Level II	Male		13	1	9	27	50			
Level II Total		0	24	1	12	40	77			
Level III	Female		1				1			
Level III	Male						0			
Level III Total		0	1	0	0	0	1			
Grand Total		0	35	1	23	70	129			

	Number of HCP Clients by Ethnicity and Level of Care Coordination								
Program Level	Ethnicity	Dolores	Montezuma	San Juan	Archuleta	La Plata	Total Level by Ethnicity		
Level I	Chinese				1		1		
Level I	Hispanic		1				1		
Level I	Non Hispanic		1			10	11		
Level I Total		0	2	0	1	10	13		
Level II	Hispanic		5		4		9		
Level II	Non Hispanic	1	16		2	23	42		
Level II	Unknown			1		2	3		
Level II Total		1	21	1	6	25	54		
No Level III data									
Grand Total		1	23	1	7	35	67		

HCP Top Referrals						
Referral Type	Total Number					
Community Education	1					
Community Health/Public Systems	1					
Total	2					

Number of HCP Clients by Age on October 1, 2008 and Level of Care Coordination									
Program Level	Age Group	Dolores	Montezuma	San Juan	Archuleta	La Plata	Total by Level and Age Group		
Level I	0-12 months		7		6	11	24		
Level I	13 to 36 months		1		2	6	9		
Level I	3 to 5 years					2	2		
Level I	6 to 12 years		2		1	10	13		
Level I	13 to 17 years		3		1	6	10		
Level I	18 to 21 years				2	4	6		
Level I Total		0	13	0	12	39	64		
Level II	0-12 months		3	1	2	9	15		
Level II	13 to 36 months	1	3		3	11	18		
Level II	3 to 5 years		5		2	4	11		
Level II	6 to 12 years	2	15	1	4	23	45		
Level II	13 to 17 years	1	8		6	14	29		
Level II	18 to 21 years		4		1	4	9		
Level II Total		4	38	2	18	65	127		
Level III	0-12 months						0		
Level III	13 to 36 months						0		
Level III	3 to 5 years						0		
Level III	6 to 12 years						0		
Level III	13 to 17 years						0		
Level III	18 to 21 years		1				1		
Level III Total		0	1	0	0	0	1		
Grand Total		4	52	2	30	104	192		

Number of Documented Types of Insurance and HCP Client Level of Care Coordination										
Program Level	InsuranceType	Dolores	Montezuma	San Juan	Archuleta	La Plata	Total by Level and Insurance Type			
Level I	Medicaid		4		1	7	12			
Level I	No Insurance					3	3			
Level I	Private Insurance		1		1	11	13			
Level I Total		0	5	0	2	21	28			
Level II	CHP+	2	6			6	14			
Level II	Medicaid		20	2	9	27	58			
Level II	No Insurance		10		1	5	16			
Level II	Private Insurance	1	5		6	31	43			
Level II Total		3	41	2	16	69	131			
Level III	Medicaid	İ	1				1			
Level III Total		0	1	0	0	0	1			
Grand Total		3	47	2	18	90	160			

Note: Clients can have several types of insurance active at the same time in CHIRP. This table is not a count of clients; it is a count of insurance types entered into CHIRP for active clients. A child can have an open category of no insurance at the same time as Medicaid, CHP+ or private insurance int he database. Each of those types is reported here. Insurance types HCP, Private Pay, Self Pay and No Insurance are included in the No Insurance lines.

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result					
Child Known to HCP at time of CRCSN Notification by Communication Type & Result					
Child Known to HCP	at time of CRCSN Noti	fication by Comm	unication Type	& Result	
		T	T		
County	HCP Level I	HCP Level II/III	No Capacity	Total Known	
,			. ,		
Archuleta					
No Communications	1		į	1	
Correspondence	<u>'</u> 1	<u> </u>		1	
Consultation	'			0	
One-On-One		<u>;</u> 		0	
Phone		<u>!</u>	i	0	
Total Archuleta County	2	0	0	2	
		U	U	2	
Dolores No Communications		i	i	0	
				0	
Correspondence Consultation		i i	<u> </u>	0	
One-On-One		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	0	
Phone		<u> </u>	i	0	
	^			-	
Total DoloresCounty	0	0	0	0	
La Plata			ı	^	
No Communications		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	0	
Correspondence		}		0	
Consultation		!		0	
One-On-One	4			0	
Phone	1			1	
Total La Plata County	1	0	0	1	
Montezuma					
No Communications			1	1	
Correspondence		<u> </u>		0	
Consultation				0	
One-On-One				0	
Phone				0	
Total Montezuma County	0	0	1	1	
San Juan					
No Communications				0	
Correspondence				0	
Consultation				0	
One-On-One				0	
Phone				0	
Total San Juan County	0	0	0	0	
Southwest Region Known					
No Communications	1	0	1	2	
Correspondence	1	0	0	1	
Consultation	0	0	0	0	
One-On-One	0	0	0	0	
Phone	1	0	0	1	
		-			
Southwest Region Total Known	3	0	1	4	

This table shows the number of replies entered for CRCSN notifications sent to the Regional Office. It does not include Notification Follow Up communications.

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result

<u> </u>	CRUSIN NOUNCAUDII N	replies by Communica	ilion Result	
Child Unknown	to HCP at time of CRO	CSN Notification by Con	nmunication Type & Re	sult
County	HCP Level I	HCP Level II/III	No Capacity	Total Unknown
Archuleta				
No Communications				0
Correspondence	7			7
Consultation				0
One-On-One			i !	0
Phone				0
Total Archuleta County	7		0	7
Dolores				
No Communications				0
Correspondence				0
Consultation				0
One-On-One			i	0
Phone				0
Total DoloresCounty	0	0	0	0
La Plata	-	-	-	
No Communications		1	!	0
Correspondence	9	†		9
Consultation		1	<u> </u> 	0
One-On-One		<u> </u>	<u>i</u>	0
Phone	1		!	1
Total La Plata County	10	0	0	10
Montezuma	10	0	Ū	10
No Communications			i	0
Correspondence		1	5	5
Correspondence Consultation			5	0
One-On-One			!	0
			<u> </u>	0
Phone			_	-
Total Montezuma County	00	0	5	5
San Juan				
No Communications			! !	0
Correspondence				0
Consultation				0
One-On-One		<u> </u>		0
Phone				0
Total San Juan County	0	0	0	0
Southwest Region Unknown				
No Communications	0	0	0	0
Correspondence	16	0	5	21
Consultation	0	0	0	0
One-On-One	0	0	0	0
Phone	1	0	0	1
Southwast Region Total	4-	_	_	
Unknown	17	0	5	22
	All CRC	SN Communications		
No Communications	1	0	1	2
Correspondence	17	0	5	22
Consultation	0	0	0	0
One-On-One	0	0	0	0
Phone	2	0	0	2
		<u> </u>	, v	+
Total All CRCSN	20	0	6	26
Communications	20	U	U	20

This table shows the number of replies entered for CRCSN notifications sent to the Regional Office. It does not include Notification Follow Up communications

	Number and Type of CRCSN Notification Follow Up Communications by County						
County	System Generated Letters	Correspondence	Email	One-on- One	Phone Calls	Follow Up Communications	
Archuleta						0	
Dolores						0	
La Plata						0	
Montezuma	3					3	
San Juan						0	
Total	3	0	0	0	0	3	

This table does not include CRCSN Replies included in Replies by Result Tables.

Number of Community Encounters with Encounter Result and Duration in Hours					
Group	Result	Total Encounters	Total Duration (hours)		
Developmental Disability Agency	Increased Knowledge	1	5		
Education Partners	Collaboration Transpired	3	4		
	Increased Knowledge	1	1		
Family Network	Collaboration Transpired	1	0		
	Increased Knowledge	1	3		
HCP Regional Team	Collaboration Transpired	1	3		
-	Staff Development	5	25		
Other Community Partners	Increased Knowledge	2	6		
Total		15	47		

Number of Community Encounters by County					
County Total Encounters					
Dolores County Nursing Service	1				
La Plata Health Department	14				
Total	15				

No Top Services Southwest Region: Dolores, Montezuma, Archuleta, La Plata

Number of Outcome Types from Community Encounters				
Outcome Type	Total			
Family Participation	12			
Medical Home	8			
Insurance	6			
Screening	5			
Community Care	9			
Transition	11			
Regional Operations	5			
Total	56			

Top Ten Concerns					
Concerns	Total				
Clinic	36				
Health Medical Needs (Child)	11				
Insurance	4				
Behavior/Emotional (Child)	2				
Education	2				
Health Medical Needs (Family)	2				
Medications	2				
Primary Care Needs/Medical Home	2				
Speech-language	2				
Support Systems	2				
Total	65				

Tri-County Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data October 2008 - September 2009

All Data Tables Record ONLY Clients Who Have Had At Least 1 Communication Entered in CHIRP Between October 2008 and September 2009

Number of HCF	Number of HCP Clients by Level of Care Coordination and Number and Percent of Clients Having Primary Care Provider Documented								
			% with		# with				
	Elbert	# with PCP	PCP	TriCounty	PCP	% with PCP	Total	# with PCP	% with PCP
Level I	26		0%	1,269	87	7%	1,295	87	7%
Level II			0%	224	133	59%	224	133	59%
Level III			0%	25	14	56%	25	14	56%
Total	26	0	0%	1,518	234	15%	1,544	234	15%

Number of HCP Clients by Race and Level of Care Coordination					
	Elbert	TriCounty	Total		
Level I					
Asian		1	1		
B (Black)		1	1		
Caucasian/White		12	12		
Hispanic		2	2		
Not Specified		7	7		
Other		1	1		
UNK		1	1		
Total Level I	0	25	25		
Level II					
A (Asian)		1	1		
Afro-American/Black		2	2		
Caucasian/White		37	37		
H (Hispanic)		2	2		
Hispanic		2	2		
Not Specified		22	22		
Other		14	14		
UNK		1	1		
Total Level II	0	81	81		
Level III					
Afro-American/Black	1	1	1		
American Indian/Alaskan		1	1		
Caucasian/White		5	5		
Not Specified	1	3	3		
Total Level III	1	10	10		
Total All Levels		116	116		

Number of Types of Insurance Recorded for Clients and					
Le	vel of Care Coord				
	Elbert	TriCounty	Total		
Level I					
CHP+		7	7		
Medicaid		64	64		
No Insurance		7	7		
Private Insurance		62	62		
Total Level I	0	140	140		
Level II					
CHP+		8	8		
Medicaid		103	103		
No Insurance		40	40		
Private Insurance		39	39		
Total Level II	0	190	190		
Level III					
CHP+		4	4		
Medicaid		13	13		
No Insurance		3	3		
Private Insurance		10	10		
Total Level III	0	30	30		
Total All Levels	0	360	360		

Total By Insurance Type , All Levels of Care Coordination						
CHP+	0	19	19			
Medicaid	0	180	180			
No Insurance	0	50	50			
Private Insurance	0	111	111			
Total By Insurance Type 0 360 360						

Note: Clients can have several types of insurance active at the same time in CHIRP. This table is <u>not</u> a count of clients; it is a count of insurance types entered into CHIRP for active clients. A child can have an open category of no insurance at the same time as Medicaid, CHP+ or private insurance in the database. Each of those types is reported here. Insurance types *HCP*, *Private Pay*, *Self Pay* and *No Insurance* are included in the *No Insurance* lines.

Number of HCP Clients by Age on October 1, 2008 and Level of Care Coordination					
	Elbert	TriCounty	Total		
Level I					
0-12 months	11	939	950		
13 to 36 months	14	278	292		
3 to 5 years	1	25	26		
6 to 12 years		15	15		
13 to 17 years		5	5		
18 to 21 years		7	7		
Total Level I	26	1,269	1,295		
Level II					
0-12 months		85	85		
13 to 36 months		45	45		
3 to 5 years		22	22		
6 to 12 years		41	41		
13 to 17 years		18	18		
18 to 21 years		13	13		
Total Level II	0	224	224		
Levell III					
0-12 months			0		
13 to 36 months		1	1		
3 to 5 years		1	1		
6 to 12 years		6	6		
13 to 17 years		7	7		
18 to 21 years		10	10		
Total Level III	0	25	25		
Total All Levels	26	1,518	1,544		

Number of HCP Clients by Gender and Level of Care Coordination				
	Elbert	TriCounty	Total	
Level I				
Female	10	526	536	
Male	16	721	737	
Total Level I	26	1,247	1,273	
Level II				
Female		95	95	
Male		132	132	
Total Level II	0	227	227	
Level III				
Female		7	7	
Male		19	19	
Total Level III	0	26	26	
Total All Levels	26	1,500	1,526	

HCP Clients by Ethnicity and Level of Care Coordination				
	Elbert	Elbert TriCounty Total		
Level I				
Hispanic		7	7	
Mexican		2	2	
Non Hispanic		8	8	
Unknown		5	5	
Total Level I	0	22	22	
Level II				
Hispanic		46	46	
Mexican		8	8	
Non Hispanic		29	29	
Unknown		3	3	
Total Level II	0	86	86	
Level III				
Hispanic		3	3	
Non Hispanic		4	4	
Unknown		2	2	
Total Level III	0	9	9	
Total All Levels	0	117	117	

Tri-County Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data, 2008-2009

HCP Top 10 Services				
Service Type	Number			
Care Coordination Services	9			
Education Materials	8			
Cognitive Therapy	7			
Parent to Parent Support	7			
Physical Therapy	6			
Food	5			
Patient, Family and Support Systems Education	5			
SSI Assistance	5			
Basic Needs Family/Cleint Education	4			
Nutrition and Diet Consultation	4			
Total	60			

Number of Community Encounters with Encounter Result and Duration in Hours			
Group	Result	l otal Encounters	Total Duration (hours)
Community Health Provider	Collaboration Transpired	16	67
•	Community Training	4	10
	Increased Awareness	6	24
	Increased Knowledge	8	59
	Initiated Networking	12	28
	Procedures/Policies		
	established/developed/		
	revised	1	1
	Staff Development	2	4
Developmental Disability Agency	Collaboration Transpired	27	73
	Community Training	1	5
	Increased Awareness	5	19
	Increased Knowledge	38	99
	Initiated Networking	4	9
	Procedures/Policies established/developed/		
	revised	3	5
	Staff Development	2	28
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Education Partners	Collaboration Transpired	27	63
	Community Training	2	9
	Increased Awareness	6	20
	Increased Knowledge	10	50
	Initiated Networking	6	17
	Staff Development	1	2
Family Network	Collaboration Transpired	15	46
	Community Training	22	82
	Increased Awareness	10	53
	Increased Knowledge	1	3
	Initiated Networking Procedures/Policies	5	28
	established/developed/revis	1	5
	Staff Development	1	4
HCP Regional Team	Collaboration Transpired	33	144
	Community Training	1	11
	Increased Awareness	17	108
	Increased Knowledge	7	67
	Initiated Networking	5	14
	Procedures/Policies	Ŭ	17
	established/developed/	4	40
Other Community Partners	revised Collaboration Transpired	53	16 124
Other Community Partners			
	Community Training	9	78
	Grant Writing Improved Community	5	38
	Identification of CYSHCN	2	3
	Increased Awareness	23	102
	Increased Knowledge	36	302
	Increased Knowledge Initiated Networking	19	74
	Procedures/Policies	13	14
	established/developed/	l	
	revised	10	27
	Staff Development	5	40
Public Officials	Increased Awareness	2	3
	Increased Knowledge	2	22
Total		469	1,981

HCP Top 10 Referrals			
Referral Type	Number		
Community Family Support	38		
Community Education	15		
Early Intervention	14		
Community Health/Insurance	13		
Community Health/Public Systems	8		
Community Financial	4		
Physical Therapist	2		
Hospital	2		
Audiologist	1		
Nutrition	1		
Total	98		

Number of Outcome Types from Community Encounters		
Outcome Type	Total	
Family Participation	179	
Medical Home	49	
Insurance	23	
Screening	30	
Community Care	243	
Transition	22	
Regional Operations 85		
Total	631	

Number of Community Encounters by County		
County Total Encounters		
Elbert County Nursing Service 0		
TriCounty Health Dept 469		
Total	469	

HCP Top 10 Concerns				
Concern	Total Concerns			
Health Medical Needs (Child)	82			
Other	54			
Nutrition/Feeding	53			
Insurance	48			
Family Relationships	43			
Health Medical Needs (Family)	41			
Support Systems	40			
Education	39			
Motor	38			
Financial	35			
Total	473			

Tri-County Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data, 2008-2009

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result						
Child Known to HCP at time of CRCSN	N Notification					
Communication Result	No Communications	Correspondence	Consultation	One-On-One	Phone	Total
Already in Non-HCP Services	34		47		5	86
Child out of Home	2		2			4
Diagnosis Low Priority	51	1				52
Family has No concerns	9		10		9	28
HCP Level I	1				5	6
HCP Level II/III	6		4	6	2	18
Lost to Follow-up	3	2	1		15	21
Moved out of State						0
No Response from Family	3	5	3		7	18
Terminally III/Deceased	1		1		1	3
Total Known Client Replies	110	8	68	6	44	236
Child Unknown to HCP at time of CRC	SN Notification					
Already in Non-HCP Services	50		23		16	89
Child out of Home	3		1		1	5
Diagnosis Low Priority	466	1	11			478
Family has No concerns	4			1	92	97
HCP Level I					20	20
HCP Level II/III	2				5	7
Lost to Follow-up	7	2			51	60
Moved out of State				1	3	4
No Response from Family	13	20			81	114
Terminally III/Deceased					2	2
Total Unknown Client Replies	545	23	35	2	271	876
Total CRCSN Replies, Known and Unk	known Clients					
Already in Non-HCP Services	84	0	70		21	175
Child out of Home	5	0	3		1	9
Diagnosis Low Priority	517	2	11		0	530
Family has No concerns	13	0	10	1	101	125
HCP Level I	1	0	0		25	26
HCP Level II/III	8	0	4		7	25
Lost to Follow-up	10	4	1		66	81
Moved out of State	0	0	0	1	3	4
No Response from Family	16	25	3		88	132
Terminally III/Deceased	1	0	1		3	5
Total CRCSN Replies	655	31	103	8	315	1,112

This table shows the number of replies entered for CRCSN notifications sent to the Regional Office. It does not include Notification Follow Up communications.

	Number and Type of CRCSN Notification Follow Up Communications by County					
						Total Notification
	System Generated				Phone	Follow Up
County	Letters	Correspondence	Email	One-on-One	Calls	Communications
Elbert		13			10	23
TriCounty	376	17			200	593
Total	376	30	0	0	210	616

This table does not include replies reported in CRCSN Notification Replies by Result tables

Weld Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data October 2008 - September 2009

All Data Tables Record ONLY Clients Who Have Had At Least 1 Communication Entered in CHIRP Between October 2008 and September 2009

Number of HCP Clie	ents by Level of Care C and s Having Primary Care					
	# with % with					
	Total	PCP	PCP			
Level I	231	9	4%			
Level II	77	64	83%			
Level III	3 0%					
Total	311	73	23%			

HCP Clients by Race and Level of Care Coordination		
	Total	
Level I		
Caucasian/White	10	
Hispanic	1	
Unknown	1	
White	1	
Total Level I	13	
Level II		
Afro-American/Black	2	
Asian	1	
Black	2	
Caucasian/White	26	
Hispanic	2	
Other	7	
Unknown	1	
White	34	
Total Level II	75	
Level III		
Caucasian/White	1	
Total Level III	1	
Total All Levels	89	

HCP Clients by Insurance Types				
Level I				
CHP+				
Medicaid	13			
No Insurance				
Private Insurance	6			
Total Level I	19			
Level II				
CHP+	10			
Medicaid	80			
No Insurance	46			
Private Insurance	14			
Total Level II Level III CHP+ Medicaid No Insurance Private Insurance Total Level III	150			
Total All Levels	170			
Total All Levels	170			
Number of Types of Insurance Recorded for Clients and Level of Care Coordination				
CHP+	10			
Medicaid	93			
No Insurance	46			
Private Insurance	21			
Total By Insurance Type	170			

Note: Clients can have several types of insurance active at the same time in CHIRP. This table is <u>not</u> a count of clients; it is a count of insurance types entered into CHIRP for active clients. A child can have an open category of no insurance at the same time as Medicaid, CHP+ or private insurance in the database. Each of those types is reported here. Insurance types HCP, Private Pay, Self Pay and No Insurance are included in the No Insurance lines.

Number of HCP Clients by Age on October 1, 2008 and Level of Care Coordination				
Level I				
0-12 months	172			
13 to 36 months	49			
3 to 5 years				
6 to 12 years	4			
13 to 17 years	2			
18 to 21 years	2			
Total Level I	229			
Level II				
0-12 months	11			
13 to 36 months	17			
3 to 5 years	5			
6 to 12 years	23			
13 to 17 years	13			
18 to 21 years	10			
Total Level II	79			
Levell III				
0-12 months				
13 to 36 months				
3 to 5 years				
6 to 12 years	1			
13 to 17 years				
18 to 21 years	2			
Total Level III	3			
Total All Levels	311			

Number of HCP Clients by Gender and Level of Care Coordination			
Level I			
Female	95		
Male	133		
Total Level I	228		
Level II			
Female	31		
Male	48		
Total Level II	79		
Level III			
Female	1		
Male	2		
Total Level III	3		
Total All Levels	310		

HCP Clients by Ethnicity and Level of Care Coordination		
Level I		
Hispanic	7	
Non Hispanic	2	
Unknown	2	
Total Level I	11	
Level II		
Central/South Americ	1	
Hispanic	50	
Mexican	11	
Non Hispanic	3	
Unknown	9	
Total Level II	74	
Level III		
Hispanic		
Non Hispanic	1	
Unknown		
Total Level III	1	
Total All Levels	86	

Weld Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data 2008-2009

HCP Top 10 Services					
Service Type Number					
Transportation to and from Services in CCP	19				
Clinic Specialty, TCH	13				
Clinic Specialty, Non-HCP	7				
SSI Assistance	7				
Exercise Equipment & Programs at Health Club	6				
Health Insurance Assistance	6				
Clinic Ortho/Rehab, HCP	5				
Dental Services	5				
Finances	5				
Funding Resources	5				
Total	78				

HCP Top 10 Referrals					
Referral Type	Number				
Community Financial	163				
Community Family Support	55				
Community Education	31				
HCP Staff	22				
Community Health/Public Systems	16				
Community Health/Insurance	12				
Dentist	5				
Early Intervention	4				
Cardiologist	3				
Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation	3				
Total	314				

Number of Community Encounters with Encounter Result and Duration in Hours						
Group	Result	Total Encounters	Total Duration (hours)			
Community Health Provider	Collaboration Transpired	1	1			
	Increased Knowledge	2	1			
	Initiated Networking	1	0			
Developmental Disability Agency	Community Training	1	2			
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	1	2			
	Increased Awareness	1	2			
	Increased Knowledge	8	15			
	Initiated Networking	6	3			
Education Partners	Increased Awareness	3	11			
	Increased Knowledge	7	16			
	Initiated Networking	2	1			
Faith Based Partner	Increased Knowledge	1	0			
	Initiated Networking	3	2			
Family Network	Increased Knowledge	3	4			
	Initiated Networking	1	0			
HCP Regional Team	Increased Awareness	1	5			
	Increased Knowledge	8	35			
	Initiated Networking	3	8			
	Procedures/Policies established/developed/revised	6	9			
Other Community Partners	Collaboration Transpired	1	4			
	Increased Awareness	3	4			
	Increased Knowledge	25	53			
	Initiated Networking	65	98			
Total		153	273			

Number of Outcome Types from Community Encounters				
Outcome Type	Total			
Family Participation	24			
Medical Home	3			
Insurance	12			
Screening	1			
Community Care	131			
Transition	4			
Regional Operations	21			
Total	196			

Number of Community Encounters by County			
County Total Encounte			
Weld County Dept of Public Health			
and Environment	153		
Total	153		

Top 10 Concerns				
Concerns	Total			
Health Medical Needs (Child)	31			
Health Medical Needs (Family)	31			
Support Systems	29			
Clothing	28			
Nutrition/Feeding	28			
Motor	27			
Transportation	27			
Vision	27			
Food	26			
Housing	26			
Total	280			

Weld Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data 2008-2009

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result

Communication Result	No Communications	Correspondence	Consultation	One-On- One	Phone	Total
Child Known to HCP at time of CRCSN Notification						
Already in Non-HCP Services	1	2			1	4
Family has No concerns	2	1			1	4
HCP Level I	1					1
HCP Level II/III	2				1	3
Lost to Follow-up	1	3				4
No Capacity						0
No Response from Family	22	16				38
Total Known	29	22	0	0	3	54
Child Not Known to HCP at time of	CRCSN Notification					
Already in Non-HCP Services					5	5
Family has No concerns		1			7	8
HCP Level I					1	1
HCP Level II/III					1	1
Lost to Follow-up		4				4
No Capacity		1				1
No Response from Family	46	94			4	144
Total Unknown	46	100	0	0	18	164
Total CRCSN - Region - Known an	d Unknown Combined					
Already in Non-HCP Services	1	2	0	0	6	9
Family has No concerns	2	2	0	0	8	12
HCP Level I	1	0	0	0	1	2
HCP Level II/III	2	0	0	0	2	4
Lost to Follow-up	1	7	0	0	0	8
No Capacity	0	1	0	0	0	1
No Response from Family	68	110	0	0	4	182
Total CRCSN Communications	75	122	0	0	21	218

This table shows the number of replies entered for CRCSN notifications sent to the Regional Office. It does not include the Notification Follow Up communications.

Number and Type of CRCSN Notification Follow Up Communications by County						
County	System Generated Letters	Correspondence	Email	One-on- One	Phone Calls	Total Notification Follow Up Communications
Weld	356	6			6	368
Total	356	6	0	0	6	368

This table does not include replies reported in CRCSN Notification Replies by Result tables

Western Slope Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data October 2008 - September 2009

All Data Tables Record ONLY Clients Who Have Had At Least 1 Communication Entered in CHIRP Between October 2008 and September 2009

Number of HCP Clients		Delta	Eagle	Garfield	Gunnison	Hinsdale	Mesa	Montrose	Ouray	Pitkin	San Miguel	Summit	Region Total
Level I	Number of Clients	25	64	77	16		294	29	3	16	3	34	561
201011	Number of Clients with PCP	1	10	2	1		8	20		10		1	23
	Percent of Clients with PCP	4%	16%	3%	6%		3%	0%	0%			3%	4%
	1.01	470	10%	376	0%		376	076	0%			376	476
LevelII	Number of Clients	52	23	57	5		154	34	7	1			333
	Number of Clients with PCP	17	5	26	1		40	14	4				107
	Percent of Clients with PCP	33%	22%	46%	20%		26%	41%	57%				32%
Level III	Number of Clients		1	2			5	1					9
	Number of Clients with PCP		1	1			1	1					4
	Percent of Clients with PCP		100%	50%			20%	100%					44%
Grand Total All Lo	evels												
	Number of Clients	77	88	136	21	0	453	64	10	17	3	34	903
	Number of Clients with PCP	18	16	29	2	0	49	15	4	0	0	1	134
	Percent of Clients with PCP	23%	18%	21%	10%		11%	23%	40%		0%	3%	15%

	Number of HCP Clients by Gender and Level of Care Coordination													
Program Level	Gender	Delta	Eagle	Garfield	Gunnison	Mesa	Montrose	Ouray	Pitkin	San Miguel	Summit	Total Level by Gender		
Level I	Female	13	30	30	9	85	10	1	6	2	15	201		
Level I	Male	11	33	47	7	128	19	2	10	1	19	277		
Level I Total		24	63	77	16	213	29	3	16	3	34	478		
Level II	Female	21	10	28	1	72	18	5	1			156		
Level II	Male	32	13	31	4	89	16	2				187		
Level II Total		53	23	59	5	161	34	7	1	0	0	343		
Level III	Female		1			2						3		
Level III	Male		1	1		3	1					6		
Level III Total		0	2	1	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	9		
Grand Total		77	88	137	21	379	64	10	17	3	34	830		

No data entered for Hinsdale County

Western Slope Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data, 2008-2009

	HCP Clients by Ethnicity, Western Slope													
Program Level	Ethnicity	Delta	Eagle	Garfield	Gunnison	Mesa	Montrose	Ouray	Pitkin	Summit	Total Level by Ethnicity			
Level I	Hispanic		10	2		5	1			1	19			
Level I	Mexican					1					1			
Level I	Non Hispanic	5	5	2	2	17	1	2	1	1	36			
Level I Total		5	15	4	2	23	2	2	1	2	56			
Level II	Hispanic	11	13	27	2	28	7				88			
Level II	Non Hispanic	38	3	21	3	110	11	6			192			
Level II Total		49	16	48	5	138	18	6	0	0	280			
Level III	Hispanic		1								1			
Level III	Non Hispanic			1		3	1				5			
Level III Total		0	1	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	6			
Grand Total		54	32	53	7	164	21	8	1	2	342			

			HCP CI	ients by Race and Leve	el of Care Coordination	on, Western Slope					
Program Level	Race	Delta	Eagle	Garfield	Gunnison	Mesa	Montrose	Ouray	Pitkin	Summit	Total Level by Race
Level I	Afro-American/Black					1					1
Level I	Austrailian - Caucasian					1					1
Level I	Caucasian/White	5	8	5	2	21	1	2	1	1	46
Level I	H (Hispanic)					9					9
Level I	Hispanic					1				1	2
Level I	Not Specified		4								4
Level I	Other		2		0						2
Level I	W (White)					1					1
Level I Total		5	14	5	2	34	1	2	1	2	66
Level II	Afro-American/Black						1				1
Level II	American Indian/Alaskan					1	1				2
Level II	Asian	1									1
Level II	Caucasian/White	36	6	27	4	121	12	6			212
Level II	H (Hispanic)		1	1							2
Level II	Not Specified		1	3		3	1				8
Level II	O (Other)					1					1
Level II	Other	6	1	9		7	1				24
Level II	Unknown		1								1
Level II	W (White)					2					2
Level II	White			1							1
Level II Total		43	10	41	4	135	16	6	0	0	255
Level III	Caucasian/White		1	1		4	1				7
Level III	Not Specified		1								1
Level III Total		0	2	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	8
Grand Total	<u> </u>	48	26	47	6	173	18	8	1	2	329

No data entered for Hinsdale County

Top Ten Se	rvices
Service Type	Total Number
Clinic Neurology, HCP	210
Clinic Cardiology, HCP	39
Clinic Rehab, HCP	21
Clinic Orthopedic, HCP	10
Cognitive Therapy	2
Dental Services	2
Massage	2
Activites of Daily Living	1
Care Coordination Services	1
Clinic Specialty, TCH	1
Total	289

Top Referrals	
Referral Type	Number
Community Health/Insurance	10
Community Family Support	2
Community Health/Public Systems	2
Family Health Clinic	1
Community Center Board	1
Community Financial	1
Housing	1
Total	18

Western Slope Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data, 2008-2009

			Numbe	r of HCP Cli	ients by Age	on October 1	1, 2008					
					and							
		T		Level o	of Care Coord	dination						
Program Level	Age Group	Delta	Eagle	Garfield	Gunnison	Mesa	Montrose	Ouray	Pitkin	San Miguel	Summit	Total by Level and Age Group
Level I	0-12 months	16	33	58	12	217	20	1	15	3	26	401
Level I	13 to 36 months	4	14	15	2	43	3				5	86
Level I	3 to 5 years	1	6	3		4	1				2	17
Level I	6 to 12 years	2	6			11	3	1	1			24
Level I	13 to 17 years		1		1	5	1	1				9
Level I	18 to 21 years	1	4	1	1	3	1				1	12
Level I Total		24	64	77	16	283	29	3	16	3	34	549
Level II	0-12 months	8		4	2	18	3					35
Level II	13 to 36 months	10	9	8	2	27	4	1				61
Level II	3 to 5 years	7	2	7		18	5					39
Level II	6 to 12 years	17	7	25		67	19	2				137
Level II	13 to 17 years	9	4	13		27	2	4	1			60
Level II	18 to 21 years	2	1	3	1	8	1					16
Level II Total		53	23	60	5	165	34	7	1	0	0	348
Level III	0-12 months											0
Level III	13 to 36 months		1									1
Level III	3 to 5 years											0
Level III	6 to 12 years					2	1					3
Level III	13 to 17 years					1						1
Level III	18 to 21 years		1	1		2						4
Level III Total	·	0	2	1	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	9
Grand Total	•	77	89	138	21	453	64	10	17	3	34	906

			Number of		s by Documen and of Care Coord	ited Types of I ination	nsurance					
Program Level	InsuranceType	Delta	Eagle	Garfield	Gunnison	Mesa	Montrose	Ouray	Pitkin	San Miguel	Summit	Total Insurance by Level
Level I	CHP+		3	1		5	1		1			11
Level I	Medicaid		5	2		85	4					96
Level I	No Insurance		5	2		2			1			10
Level I	Private Insurance		6	2	1	45	2	2			2	60
Level I Total			19	7	1	137	7	2	2	0	2	177
Level II	CHP+		2	9		18	3					32
Level II	Medicaid		10	35	5	118	27	3				198
Level II	No Insurance		6	10	1	17	3	2				39
Level II	Private Insurance		3	27	2	60	11	7	1			111
Level II Total			21	81	8	213	44	12	1	0	0	380
Level III	CHP+						1					1
Level III	Medicaid		1	1		3						5
Level III	No Insurance					1						1
Level III	Private Insurance			1		1						2
Level III Total	<u> </u>		1	2	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	9
Grand Total			41	90	9	355	52	14	3	0	2	566

No data entered for Hinsdale County

Note: Clients can have several types of insurance active at the same time in CHIRP. This table is <u>not</u> a count of clients; it is a count of insurance types entered into CHIRP for active clients. A child can have an open category of no insurance at the same time as Medicaid, CHP+ or private insurance in the database. Each of those types is reported here. Insurance types *HCP*, *Private Pay*, *Self Pay* and *No Insurance* are included in the *No Insurance* lines.

Western Slope Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data, 2008-2009

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result

Child Known to HCP at time of CRCSN Notification by Communication Type & Result													
	Child Kn	own to HCP at	time of CRCSN	Notification i	oy Communi	ication Type & Re	esuit						
	T	T T							I				
County	Already in Non- HCP Services	Child Out of Home	Diagnosis Low Priority	Family Has No Concerns	HCP Level I	HCP Level II/III	No Response from Family	No Capacity	Total Known				
Delta		L		L									
No Communications				į				1	1				
Correspondence									0				
Consultation									0				
One-On-One	1			! !					1				
Phone				1		1			2				
Total Delta County	1		0	1	0	1		1	4				
Eagle				•				•					
No Communications	2	1	1	:	:	1	1		3				
Correspondence	-						1		1				
Consultation							'		0				
One-On-One				ļ					0				
Phone	1			!					0				
Total Eagle County	2		0	0	0	0	2	0	4				
Garfield			U	U	U	U		U	4				
No Communications	2				1				2				
Correspondence	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>		1	3				
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>		ı	0				
Consultation One-On-One					1				1				
	2			1	<u>'</u>	1			4				
Phone			_	1	_								
Total Garfield County	4		0	1	2	1	0	1	9				
Gunnison													
No Communications	1				<u> </u>				1				
Correspondence									0				
Consultation									0				
One-On-One	1								1				
Phone									0				
Total GunnisonCounty	2		0	0	0	0	0	0	2				
Mesa													
No Communications	6			2	3	4	5	6	26				
Correspondence	1						1		2				
Consultation					1	1			2				
One-On-One				!	2	1			3				
Phone				1			1		2				
Total Mesa County	7		0	3	6	6	7	6	35				
Montrose													
No Communications	1		1		1	1			4				
Correspondence									0				
Consultation									0				
One-On-One					İ	1			1				
Phone									0				
Total Montrose County	1		1	0	1	2	0	0	5				
Ouray				, and the second		_	_						
No Communications						1			1				
Correspondence	1					'			0				
Consultation	1				 				0				
One-On-One	<u> </u>	I	<u> </u>	! !	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			0				
Phone	<u> </u>				 				0				
	0		0	0	0	1	0	0	1				
Total Ouray County	U		U	U	U	1	U	U	1 1				
San Miguel									0				
No Communications		l .	l	l .	!	l	l i		0				

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result

Child Known to HCP at time of CRCSN Notification by Communication Type & Result											
					•	- 1					
County	Already in Non- HCP Services	Child Out of Home	Diagnosis Low Priority	Family Has No Concerns	HCP Level I	HCP Level II/III	No Response from Family	No Capacity	Total Known		
Correspondence									0		
Consultation									0		
One-On-One									0		
Phone									0		
Total San Miguel County	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Summit											
No Communications					ŀ				0		
Correspondence									0		
Consultation									0		
One-On-One									0		
Phone									0		
Total Summit County	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Western Slope Region - Total Known											
No Communications	12		1	2	5	6	6	7	39		
Correspondence	1		0	0	0	0	2	1	4		
Consultation	0		0	0	1	1	0	0	2		
One-On-One	2		0	0	3	2	0	0	7		
Phone	2		0	3	0	2	1	0	8		
Western Slope Region Total Known	17		1	5	9	11	9	8	60		

This table shows the number of replies entered for CRCSN notifications sent to the Regional Office. It does not include Notification Follow Up communications

No data entered for Hinsdale County

Western Slope Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data, 2008-2009

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result

Child Unknown to HCP at time of CRCSN Notification by Communication Type & Result													
County	Already in Non- HCP Services	Child Out of Home	Diagnosis Low Priority	Family Has No Concerns	HCP Level I	HCP Level II/III	Lost to Follow Up	Moved Out of State	No Response from Family	No Capacity	Total Unknow		
Delta		•	.					•					
No Communications		 		1	 		2	į		4	7		
Correspondence Consultation					<u> </u>		<u> </u>				0		
One-On-One		<u> </u>	! !		 		 	! !		<u> </u>	0		
Phone	_	 		6	 		1	<u> </u>		ļ	7		
otal Delta County	0		0	7	0	0	3	0	0	4	14		
agle	, and the second		,			Ţ.			J				
lo Communications	2		10		: :		I	ļ	1	8	21		
orrespondence	1		4		i		i	<u>.</u>	3	i	8		
Consultation							ĺ				0		
ne-On-One					1		i			İ	0		
hone				2	2						4		
otal Eagle County	3		14	2	2	0	0	0	4	8	33		
arfield													
lo Communications							3			18	21		
orrespondence			1				2		3		6		
onsultation										!	0		
ne-On-One	1			1					-		2		
hone	13			11	1		1	1			27		
otal Garfield County	14		1	12	1	0	6	1	3	18	56		
iunnison													
o Communications	1				i .		į	1		2	4		
orrespondence					}		}	}		}	0		
onsultation		1			<u> </u>		<u> </u>				1		
One-On-One	2				ļ		<u> </u>				2		
hone				1			1				2		
otal GunnisonCounty	3		0	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	9		
Mesa	4		40							44	0.4		
lo Communications	1		16			1	2		18	44	64 19		
orrespondence consultation		ļ	<u> </u>		 		1 1	<u> </u>	18	ļ	0		
One-On-One				1	1	3	<u> </u>				5		
hone	2			'	1	3	ļ		1		4		
otal Mesa County	3	 	16	1	2	4	3	0	19	44	92		
lontrose	3		10	1		4	3	U	19	-44	32		
lo Communications			3					1		3	7		
orrespondence	1	 	2		 		 	 	3	J	5		
Consultation	1				 		i .		Ü	 	1		
ne-On-One	<u> </u>				!		!	<u> </u>		!	0		
hone	2	<u> </u>			ļ .		ļ	!		!	2		
otal Montrose County	3		5	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	15		
Duray			-	-					-	-			
o Communications							1			2	2		
orrespondence					†		†				0		
onsultation							!			i	0		
ne-On-One							į				0		
hone							<u> </u>				0		
otal Ouray County	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2		
an Miguel													
lo Communications							1			4	4		
orrespondence			9	3				1	2	1	16		
onsultation							!	!		!	0		
ne-On-One		1									0		
hone										1	1		
otal San Miguel County	0		9	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	21		

Summit						

CRCSN Notification Replies by Communication Result

		Obilid Halmann to HOD a	:	1 N - ((() ()	h 0	France O. Donnell				
		Child Unknown to HCP a	t time of CRCSI	N Notification	by Communication	ype & Result				
No Communications		1		1 1		1 1		1	1	0
Correspondence		9	3	 		<u>i i</u>		1	1	14
Consultation	i	i i	-	1 1					1	0
One-On-One									1	0
Phone									1	1
Total Summit County	0	9	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	15
			Western Slope	Region - Total L	Jnknown					
No Communications	4	29	1	0	1	7	2	1	85	130
Correspondence	1	16	3	0	0	3	1	29	1	54
Consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One-On-One	3	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	9
Phone	17	0	20	4	0	3	1	1	1	47
Western Slope Region - Total	26	45	26	5		40		0.4	0.7	241
Unknown	26	45	26	5	4	13	4	31	87	241
All CRCSN Notifications										
No Communications	16	30	3	5	7	7	2	7	92	169
Correspondence	2	16	3	0	0	3	1	31	2	58
Consultation	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
One-On-One	5	0	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	16
Phone	19	0	23	4	2	3	1	2	1	55
Total All CRCSN Communications	43	46	31	14	15	13	4	40	95	301

This table shows the number of replies entered for CRCSN notifications sent to the Regional Office. It does not include Notification Follow Up communications No data entered for Hinsdale County

Number and Type of CRCSN Notification Follow Up Communications by County						
County	System Generated Letters	Corresponden ce	Email	One-on-One	Phone Calls	Follow Up Communications
Delta						0
Eagle	10					10
Garfield	23				1	24
Gunnison						0
Mesa	27					27
Montrose	4					4
Ouray						0
Pitkin					1	1
San Miguel						0
Summit	12	4		1	9	26
Total	76	4	0	1	11	92

This table does not include replies reported in CRCSN Notification Replies by Result tables No data entered for Hinsdale County

Western Slope Regional Office HCP CHIRP Data, 2008-2009

Number of Community Encounters with Encounter Result and Duration in Hours					
Group	Result	Total Encounters	Total Duration (hours)		
Community Health Provider	Collaboration Transpired	2	1		
	Community Training	1	1		
	Increased Knowledge	1	5		
	Initiated Networking	4	1		
Developmental Disability Agency	Collaboration Transpired	3	3		
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	1	1		
	Increased Awareness	7	16		
	Increased Knowledge	2	2		
	Initiated Networking	1	2		
	Procedures/Policies established/developed/revised	3	8		
Education Partners	Collaboration Transpired	1	2		
	Community Training	1	2		
Faith Based Partner	Collaboration Transpired	1	1		
Family Network	Collaboration Transpired	3	4		
	Increased Awareness	3	8		
	Initiated Networking	3	4		
	Procedures/Policies established/developed/revised	1	1		
HCP Regional Team	Collaboration Transpired	3	7		
	Community Training	1	1		
	Improved Community Identification of CYSHCN	1	1		
	Increased Awareness	25	43		
	Increased Knowledge	7	18		
	Initiated Networking	3	4		
	Procedures/Policies established/developed/revised	2	4		
	Staff Development	1	1		
Other Community Partners	Collaboration Transpired	16	22		
	Community Training	9	15		
	Grant Writing	1	2		
	Increased Awareness	21	36		
	Increased Knowledge	4	4		
	Initiated Networking	6	5		
	Procedures/Policies established/developed/revised	2	3		
Total		140	222		

Number of Outcome Types from Community Encounters				
Outcome Type	Total			
Family Participation	13			
Medical Home	17			
Insurance	1			
Screening	3			
Community Care	23			
Transition	2			
Regional Operations	92			
Total	151			

Number of Community Encounters by County				
County	Total Encounters			
Eagle County Health and Human Services	1			
Garfield County Nrsg Srv	1			
Mesa County Health Department	122			
Ouray County Public Health	1			
Summit County Public Health	15			
Total	140			

Top Ten Concerns			
Concerns	Total		
Clinic	99		
Health Medical Needs (Child)	62		
Motor	14		
Insurance	12		
Financial	9		
Medications	8		
Support Systems	7		
Behavior/Emotional (Child)	6		
Cognitive	5		
Education	5		
Total	227		